

The JOURNAL *of* SOUTHERN HISTORY

Board of Editors

PAUL H. BUCK

FLETCHER M. GREEN

WESLEY F. CRAVEN

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

ELLA LONN

BELL I. WILEY

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

BERNARD MAYO

Managing Editor

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY

Editorial Associate

HENRY L. SWINT

VOLUME X

FEBRUARY-NOVEMBER, 1944

Published Quarterly by The Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS OF VOLUME X

ARTICLES

<i>Three Centuries of Southern Records, 1607-1907.</i> J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton	3
<i>James R. Chalmers and "Mahoneism" in Mississippi.</i> Willie D. Halsell ..	37
<i>The Southern Brigade: A Sidelight on the British Military Establishment in America, 1763-1775.</i> Charles L. Mowat	59
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> James W. Patton	78
<i>Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association.</i>	82
<i>Stephen Russell Mallory, Southern Naval Statesman.</i> Philip Melvin	137
<i>The Early Baptist Church in the Lower Southwest.</i> Walter B. Posey	161
<i>The Public Domain in Territorial Florida.</i> Sidney Walter Martin	174
<i>Financing and Marketing the Sugar Crop of the Old South.</i> J. Carlyle Sitterson	188
<i>Some Northern Wartime Attitudes Toward the Post-Civil War South.</i> George Winston Smith	253
<i>A Chapter of Panton, Leslie and Company.</i> Robert S. Cotterill	275
<i>Economic Sectionalism in Georgia Politics, 1825-1855.</i> Paul Murray	293
<i>The Tennessee Whigs and the Kansas-Nebraska Bill.</i> Joseph H. Parks ..	308
<i>William L. Yancey's Transition from Unionism to State Rights.</i> Austin L. Venable	331
<i>The Southwestern Frontier, 1795-1817: An Essay in Social History.</i> William B. Hamilton	389
<i>J. D. B. De Bow, the Man.</i> Ottis Clark Skipper	404
<i>Health and the Medical Profession in the Lower South, 1845-1860.</i> Martha Carolyn Mitchell	424
<i>The Scalawag in Mississippi Reconstruction.</i> David H. Donald	447
<i>Winifred and Joseph Gales, Liberals in the Old South.</i> Clement Eaton ..	461

NOTES AND DOCUMENTS

<i>Land Speculation Profits in the Chickasaw Cession.</i> James W. Silver	84
<i>The Authorship of The Slaveholder Abroad.</i> H. Prentice Miller	92

<i>A Georgia Precedent for the Freeport Question.</i> Horace Montgomery	200
<i>Some Post-War Observations of Jefferson Davis Concerning Early Aspects of the Civil War.</i> Edited by Arthur Marvin Shaw	207
<i>Notes on the Civil War Correspondence of Private Henry Tucker.</i> Hubert A. Coleman	343
<i>A Description of Seargent S. Prentiss in 1838.</i> Edited by Charles S. Sydnor	475
<i>Correspondence Relating to the Progressive Party's "Lily White" Policy in 1912.</i> Edited by Arthur S. Link	480
BOOK REVIEWS	95, 212, 356, 491
HISTORICAL NEWS AND NOTICES	121, 231, 371, 501
CONTRIBUTORS	134, 249, 386, 515
INDEX	517

The JOURNAL of
SOUTHERN
HISTORY

VOL. X

FEBRUARY, 1944

No. 1



Published quarterly by the
SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME X

FEBRUARY, 1944

NUMBER 1

Published Quarterly by
THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION
at 216 Main Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana



BOARD OF EDITORS

PAUL H. BUCK

Harvard University

FLETCHER M. GREEN

University of North Carolina

WESLEY F. CRAVEN

New York University

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

University of Texas

ELLA LONN

Coucher College

BELL I. WILEY

University of Mississippi

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON

Louisiana State University

BERNARD MAYO

University of Virginia

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

EDITORIAL ASSOCIATE

HENRY L. SWINT, Vanderbilt University

GUARANTOR

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY



Correspondence in regard to contributions to the *Journal* should be sent to the Managing Editor, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, Tennessee.

The Southern Historical Association supplies the *Journal* to its members. The annual membership fee is three dollars; upon payment of fifty dollars, any person may become a life member. Single numbers of the *Journal* are available at seventy-five cents. Membership applications and checks should be sent to James W. Patton, Secretary-Treasurer, North Carolina State College, Raleigh, North Carolina.

The Southern Historical Association disclaims responsibility for statements made by contributors.

Entered as second-class matter April 5, 1935, at the Post Office at University Station, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, under the Act of August 24, 1912. Additional entry at Nashville, Tennessee.

The Journal of Southern History

VOLUME X

FEBRUARY, 1944

NUMBER 1



Copyright, 1944, by the Southern Historical Association

CONTENTS

<i>Three Centuries of Southern Records, 1607-1907.</i> By J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton	3
<i>James R. Chalmers and "Mahoneism" in Mississippi.</i> By (Miss) Willie D. Halsell	37
<i>The Southern Brigade: A Sidelight on the British Military Establishment in America, 1763-1775.</i> By Charles L. Mowat	59
<i>Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer.</i> By James W. Patton	78
<i>Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association</i>	82
<i>Notes and Documents</i>	
Land Speculation Profits in the Chickasaw Cession. By James W. Silver	84
The Authorship of <i>The Slaveholder Abroad</i> . By H. Prentice Miller	92
<i>Book Reviews</i>	
Andrews, <i>The Soul of a Nation: The Founding of Virginia and the Projection of New England</i> , by Frank L. Owsley	95
Greene, <i>The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776</i> , by Harvey Wish	96
Meade, et al., <i>Calendar of Maryland State Papers; No. 1, The Black Books</i> , by Hayes Baker-Crothers	97
Greene, <i>The Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790</i> , by Thomas Perkins Abernethy	98
Macmillan, <i>The War Governors in the American Revolution</i> , by Charles F. Mullett	99
Koch, <i>The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson</i> , by George Harmon Knoles	101
Aptheker, <i>American Negro Slave Revolts</i> , by Theodore M. Whitfield	103
Davenport, <i>Ante-Bellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860</i> , by Joseph H. Parks	105
Berger, <i>The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860</i> , by Fletcher M. Green	106
Copeland, <i>Kendall of the Picayune</i> , by H. Bailey Carroll	107
Lawrence, <i>James Moore Wayne, Southern Unionist</i> , by S. Walter Martin	109
Meade, <i>Judah P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman</i> , by William B. Hatcher	111
Abell, <i>The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900</i> , by Walter B. Posey	112
Nixon, <i>Henry W. Grady: Spokesman of the New South</i> , by C. Vann Woodward	114
Haley, <i>George W. Littlefield, Texan</i> , by J. L. Waller	116
Goldman, <i>Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career</i> , by Allen W. Moger	117
Cabell and Hanna, <i>The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities</i> , by Thomas D. Clark	119
<i>Historical News and Notices</i>	121
Personal	121
Historical Societies	122
Bibliographical	124
<i>Contributors</i>	134

Three Centuries of Southern Records, 1607-1907

BY J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON¹

"Time and Accident are committing daily havoc on the originals deposited in our public offices. The late war has undone the work of centuries in this business. The lost cannot be recovered, but let us save what remains."² So wrote Thomas Jefferson in 1791; and in 1809, William Hening, in his introduction to the *Statutes at Large . . . of Virginia*, supplemented the statement of the man to whom he gave chief credit for making the work possible: "But it is a melancholy truth, that though we have existed as a nation but little more than two hundred years, our public offices are destitute of official documents."³

Those of us who have to do with historical documents find ourselves in better case than Hening, but there are few, if any, who do not possess a sympathetic and full understanding of the situation and of how he and Jefferson felt about it. Most of us sometimes, and many frequently, have discovered that many places where we might properly expect to find historical documents gathered and preserved were similarly destitute of those we sought.

The historians of the older days knew little of the sense of frustration, the disappointment, and the acute distress which is part of the

¹ This paper was prepared for presentation as the presidential address of the Southern Historical Association for 1943, but its delivery was prevented by the inability to hold the annual meeting.

² Thomas Jefferson to Ebenezer Hazard, February 18, 1791, in Albert E. Bergh (ed.), *The Writings of Thomas Jefferson*, 20 vols. (Washington, 1904), VIII, 127.

³ William W. Hening (ed.), *The Statutes at Large; Being a Collection of all the Laws of Virginia* [1619-1792], 13 vols. (Richmond, 1809-1823), I, iv.

common lot of the modern members of the craft. What tradition lacked of a complete story, imagination could always supply. And while reliance upon records crept in, it crept very slowly through a great many years. Nor were there many historians; and so was lacking the steady, if oftentimes fruitless, pressure which to our credit we moderns seek to apply to those in whose hands is the power to compel the keeping and the preservation of records.⁴

It is a familiar fact that men began to make records at a very early period and have continued to do so ever since. Why, it may be asked, has so small a part of such records survived?

When we apply the question to the South, we must not overlook the fact that American colonization took place in modern times, and that it was carried on by people from lands long civilized, with highly developed governments, where records, public and private, had been kept for centuries. It might have been supposed that from the beginning adequate records would be kept, in conformity with the law and the practice at home. Said Hening: "The colony of Virginia having been planted long after the revival of letters in Europe, as well as the general introduction of the use of the press, it might have been expected that everything relating to our early history would have been preserved," and then wrote the lament which serves as an introduction to this paper.

But there was, of course, a period in the beginning of practically every one of the colonies when few records, public or private, were made. The reasons for this seem fairly clear. In most cases the early settlers were not of a type to be interested in records, even when capable of making them. In a new country, far distant from the home land, confronted by the primeval forests and swamps, by wild beasts, by savages, by famine, and by disease, the settlers were fully aware that a continued existence of the settlement was highly problematical, not to say doubtful in the extreme. Why keep records, they would have asked if, indeed, they had ever thought of it.

⁴ William C. Torrence, for example, said in his paper, "Public Archives of Virginia," that outside pressure as much as anything else spurred Virginia to care for its archives. American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1906, 2 vols. (Washington, 1908), I, 134.

Further, in such periods of a community's life, its people are too busy, too concerned with the existing realities of life—indeed with its very preservation—to think about records. Only when there is reasonable probability of a future for the community, when it is envisioned as the home of their children and of their children's children through many coming generations, does the matter of keeping records assume any importance, even to the thinking portion of the population. Otherwise we might, for example, have records which, free from the taint or even suspicion of fraud, would show the fate of Raleigh's lost colony, of Ananias and Eleanor Dare, and the little girl, whose primacy among Americans of English blood possibly carried with it early destruction. As it is, the three letters, C R O "curiously carved" upon a tree, and graven on a post, "in fair capital letters" C R O A T O A N, furnish us food for imagination and little else.

I will agree, of course, that what happened to Virginia Dare exerted no influence upon the course of American history, but I venture, nevertheless, to maintain that a body of historical documents destitute of all such questions, of human feelings and behavior, of romance, if you will, of all those things that stimulate the imagination and humanize the past, would be a dreary expanse of documentary evidence.

A further question arises. Why, when once records were kept, were they not saved as they were in England? This inquiry, also, seems simple to answer. Even after the future security of the colony was assured, a stable government established, and records kept, there was, for a time at least—and usually a long time—no settled abode of the government where repositories for the preservation and care of records could be built. In such a period records followed officers—or, worse still, failed to follow—and at best were not more secure than Abraham Lincoln's law papers were in his old plug hat. There could not fail to be constant and heavy loss in such a period. Officials died and their families scattered and lost official papers, not, it must be supposed, with any special purpose or desire to do so, but from ignorance, carelessness, or procrastination. In the steady flux of American population, most of those retained by private individuals were destroyed in the course of time, but some emigrated with their holders to distant states where even

today they probably survive. I, personally, have known of three North Carolina county court records of the colonial period in private hands in other states, and in none of these cases was there, apparently, the slightest recognition of the state's title to them. Even when the colonial government had "settled down," as it were, and public buildings were erected, there was nowhere adequate protection against fire, water, vermin, insects, and even the citizenry.

And finally there was no conception anywhere of the real relation between records and history. Records were kept for strictly utilitarian reasons and in a fairly short period of time most of them seemed completely obsolete, and consequently, in the minds of most people, entirely worthless. Even among the educated there was little realization of their importance to future generations. In this connection, it must be remembered that the idea that historical writings must be fully documented to be held authentic is a relatively modern development.

When destruction seemed almost the rule with public archives, it is not difficult to determine what happened to personal papers. Of course in the early period of all the colonies there was no great amount of such material, and at no time could there have been the possibility of accumulations which by modern standards would be called large. The whole way of life made this particularly true of the South. A sparse population, widely scattered, with the most limited means of communication, with few towns and most of those small, is not given to correspondence; and the keeping of diaries and other personal records must have been very exceptional. As time went on, some people, of course—but only a minority—carried on considerable correspondence and made personal records of various kinds, but the mortality of such accumulations was tremendous. When the owner moved, as most owners did sooner or later, not only in the colonial period but all through our history, the papers were apt to be left behind, or destroyed, or lost on the way. If the owner did not move, sooner or later his house burned, or, in the rare exceptions to this rule, rats, mice, and moths were apt to get in their devilish work. The real wonder is that any at all survived.

The original southern colonies all attempted by legislation to protect their public records. Virginia, like the other colonies, was chiefly inter-

ested in proceedings in the courts, and the first mention of records in the laws of Virginia was in Act I of the Grand Assembly of 1645, which provided for records of all court cases being kept by the clerks.⁵ The preamble of an act passed in 1674, "concerning the regulating the Secretary's Office," contained the following explanation: "It appears that there hath beene a greate neglect in keeping the records in this country."⁶ This statement brought from Hening this sharp comment: "Perhaps in no civilized country whatever, were the records so badly arranged and kept as in the former *Secretary's* office of Virginia."

In November, 1713, an act was passed providing for the registration with the minister of the parish of births, christenings, and burials. A statement in the preamble recites that a similar law of 1662 "hath for a long time been disused."⁷ An act of December, 1787, for the protection of the county court records indicates that there must have been constant loss of them, as does the act of November, 1789, which made embezzlement of records a felony.⁸ But nowhere have I been able to discover any law which made provision for proper housing and care of records.

In 1715 the governor of Maryland, reporting the loss of some records and injury to others, recommended, and the legislature passed, a law penalizing such action.⁹ At the next session a committee appointed to investigate the condition of the records reported that in the move from St. Mary's to Annapolis some had been lost and a greater part of the rest were "much worn and damnified." A stronger act was then passed and was in force throughout the remainder of the colonial period.¹⁰

In North Carolina, as Stephen B. Weeks points out, the Fundamental Constitutions of Locke made the first provision for records, introducing to the English speaking world the formal recording of deeds of sale. They also specified that "The time of one's age that is born in Carolina,

⁵ Hening (ed.), *Statutes at Large*, I, 303-304.

⁶ *Ibid.*, II, 509.

⁷ *Ibid.*, II, 42-45.

⁸ *Ibid.*, XII, 497; XIII, 23.

⁹ Act of 1715, Chap. 11.

¹⁰ Act of 1716, Chap. 1. See also, Bernard C. Steiner, "Restoration of the Proprietary of Maryland," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1899, 2 vols. (Washington, 1900), I, 231-307.

shall be reckoned from the day that his birth is entered in the registry and not before"; and that no marriage should be lawful till it had been registered, "with the names of the father and mother of each party."¹¹ Penalties for failure to report births and deaths were also provided.

The *Revisal* of 1715 provided that in every precinct where there was no clerk of the church, the registrar of the precinct should record all births, marriages, and deaths.¹² Although the statute remained in force until the Revolution, there is little evidence to show that it was widely obeyed.¹³ Governor William Tryon in 1767 thus stated the case:

There is no regular register of births, burials, or marriages kept in any county in the province, although prescribed by some of our acts of assembly and a fee established for it. The reason for this neglect is chiefly owing to the extensive residence of most of the parishioners from the parish clerks or readers in their respective parishes or counties, many of which are from forty to fifty miles square and upwards, besides most families having a private burying place on their plantations.¹⁴

In 1738 an act was passed appropriating £2000 for the erection of "a sufficient gaol and office place for the safe keeping the records of the General Court,"¹⁵ but apparently none was ever built. As a matter of fact, two years later the records were at the home of the secretary on the Cape Fear where they were in danger of being lost, altered, erased, or scattered, "to the great prejudice of the inhabitants."¹⁶ In the same year Governor Gabriel Johnston complained that "the papers and records of the several offices are so dispersed that I am frequently obliged to send from one end of the province to another for them."¹⁷ The secretary, as a matter of fact, kept an office in Brunswick, another in Edenton, a third in New Bern, and a fourth in Edgecombe County.¹⁸

¹¹ Stephen B. Weeks, "Historical Review of the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina," in William L. Saunders and Walter Clark (eds.), *Colonial and State Records of North Carolina*, 30 vols. (Raleigh, etc., 1886-1914), XXX.

¹² Chap. 38.

¹³ J. R. B. Hathaway discovered such a register for Berkeley Precinct, with entries as late as the Revolution. See *North Carolina Historical and Genealogical Register* (Edenton, 1900-1903), III (1903), 199-220, 263-410.

¹⁴ *Colonial and State Records of North Carolina*, VII, 488.

¹⁵ *Ibid.*, XIII, 127.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, IV, 572.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, IV, 423.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, VI, 301.

Seven years later Governor Johnston mentioned, as a chief reason for establishing a capital and erecting public buildings, the urgent need for the preservation of the records in one place. The assembly agreed, promised consideration of the matter, mentioned the scarcity of funds, and did nothing.¹⁹ Nor did the condition of the records improve. Matthew Rowan, acting governor in 1753, wrote the Board of Trade: "The public papers have come through so many hands of late that I am the less surprised at so few of them being delivered to me; but I shall cause strict search to be made and the Papers of the late Governor and President by their executors for such as remain."²⁰

The next year Governor Arthur Dobbs said that "for want of proper places to keep the Offices in and to preserve records upon account of the changeable state of this Province," whenever officers "died, all papers die with them, for the Successors say they have got no papers, or, if any, those very insignificant, from their Predecessors."²¹ Six years later he ordered all the records taken to Wilmington. The assembly objected strongly,²² but in 1768 its clerk reported "that for want of a proper place for depositing and safe keeping" its own papers and journal books, several were "in part eaten by rats and mice and some totally destroyed."²³ Finally in 1771 the records were lodged in the Governor's Palace, where they stayed until they were removed to Raleigh.

After 1771 the only important legislation respecting records enacted for many years was the resolution of 1787, directing outgoing governors and the two houses of the general assembly to deposit all the documents in their possession with the secretary of state.²⁴

The provisions of the Fundamental Constitutions applied, of course, to South Carolina as well as to North Carolina, and because of the strength

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, IV, 721.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, V, 18.

²¹ *Ibid.*, V, 156-57.

²² "Resolved, That the Books, records and Papers of the Secretary's office being lately by the Governor's Order removed to Cape Fear near the Southern Extremity of this Province renders it Extremely expensive & difficult for the Generality of People to have the necessary recourse to that Office." *Ibid.*, VI, 412.

²³ *Ibid.*, VII, 963.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, XXIV, 951.

of the Anglican Church, which made the parish system quite effective, they were put into operation far more fully. The existence of Charleston, too, made for better keeping and preservation of records. Keeping records, however, did not always mean their preservation. It was "very discouraging," as an official wrote the Lords Proprietors in the seventeenth century after a violent hurricane, "to a public officer to find his records floating about in three feet of water in his office." And through the years many records in Charleston, both public and private, floated in water—or else could be recorded as *spurlos versenkt*. But it was not for lack of early recognition of the importance of keeping records.

In 1694 the general assembly passed "an act for the better and more certain keeping and preserving of old registers and Publique Writings of this part of the Province."²⁵ The act of 1706 "for the Establishment of Religious Worship in this Province, according to the Church of England," after providing for the establishment of a vestry in every parish, made provision also "for the keeping a fair register of all such vestry's proceedings, and for registering of all births, christenings, marriages, and burials in each respective parish."²⁶ As Alexander S. Salley points out, "The vestry of a parish not only managed the affairs of the church, but attended to the business of the parish, such as building and repairing roads, bridges, and ferries; caring for the poor and providing schooling for the children of those who were too poor to pay tuition."

Three acts closed the colony's legislation on the subject of records. They were: an "Act for Preventing the embezzellment of the Public Records of this Settlement and for obtaining the Same out of the Hands of such persons as now have the custody thereof,"²⁷ passed in February, 1719/20; the appointment of a committee in 1736 to consider "the State of the Public Records of the Province . . . and of a proper means to preserve the Records in a better manner than has been heretofore usually done"; and an act of the same year, putting into effect an English

²⁵ The Title, No. 106, appears in John F. Grimké (ed.), *The Public Laws of South Carolina . . . to 1790* (Charleston, 1790), vii.

²⁶ Title No. 256, *ibid.*, xii, 11.

²⁷ Title No. 423, *ibid.*, xx.

statute, making it a felony to "falsely make, forge, counterfeit, alter, change, deface, or erase" any record of the province.²⁸

In the years following the establishment of seats of government, central and local, in the colonies, the progress of destruction, while checked, was never stopped. State house and courthouse fires were numerous. Changes in the location of capitals and county seats occurred frequently. In Maryland, the first recorded loss of records occurred in Ingle's Rebellion, when nearly all the early ones were destroyed. St. Mary's was the capital of the province until 1695 when it was removed to Annapolis, with a considerable loss of records. Nine years later the state house burned with even greater loss.

Numerous Virginia records narrowly escaped destruction in Bacon's Rebellion, only to be otherwise lost. Fire at Jamestown in 1698, at Williamsburg in 1705 and again in 1746 when the capitol was burned, in Richmond during the Revolution, particularly in Arnold's raid, again at William and Mary in 1859, and in Richmond in 1865 when the general court building was burned by Federal troops, made a wreck of Virginia archives. Much, too, was destroyed during the intervals between fires through lack of care in storage.²⁹

North Carolina, having steadily lost records in the colonial period, as already described, lost heavily when the capitol was burned in 1831. Federal occupation of the capitol in 1865 was almost as destructive.

South Carolina suffered losses of records in the fire of 1698 and when the state house in Charleston burned in 1778, as well as in the British invasion of 1780-1781. So long as the capital remained at Charleston the records were exposed to constant danger also from tempest and flood. Later on, in the fire of 1842 there was loss, as there was when Sherman's army reached Columbia; but South Carolina's losses were lighter than those of either Virginia or North Carolina. This was partly the result of better arrangements, from the beginning, for preserving

²⁸ Title No. 650, *ibid.*, 148. For a fuller discussion of the policy of South Carolina, see Alexander S. Salley, "Preservation of South Carolina History," in *North Carolina Historical Review* (Raleigh, 1924-), IV (1927), 145-57.

²⁹ William G. Stanard, "The Virginia Archives," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1903, 2 vols. (Washington, 1904), I, 647-51; Wilmer L. Hall, "The Public Records of Virginia," in *Virginia Libraries* (Richmond, 1928-1932), IV (1931), 2-22.

records, and partly because of prompt measures to secure duplicate records whenever possible in case of destruction.³⁰

Georgia records, in addition to the perils of fire, flood, vermin, and official carelessness common to all the states, encountered those of frequent travel. During the Revolution they were taken from Savannah to Charleston, then to New Bern, and thence to Maryland, and at last to Augusta, remaining there until 1799 when they were carried to Louisville. They tarried there until 1807, when they were moved to Milledgeville, to remain there—such as survived—for sixty years, and then to come to rest, finally let us hope, in Atlanta in 1868. Anyone who has ever gone through the horrifying experience of moving—or who has watched others move—from houses long occupied will not need to be told what those moves cost in terms of destruction. And in addition, the archives lay in the path of Sherman's army in 1864 with the usual result of such proximity. The capitol was occupied and sacked, and it is little short of a miracle that any were left to be moved to Atlanta. Sufficient to say that "nearly all of the papers relating to the twenty years of the government of the Trustees which had ever been in Georgia, and many of those relating to the rule of the Royal Governors, were lost or entirely destroyed."³¹

Nor is this the whole of the sad story. The state through all these years had shown little interest in the preservation of its records, but during one period there were signs of an historical awakening. In 1824 the legislature appropriated a small sum of money to be paid to Joseph Valence Bevan, a collector of Georgia material, for the purpose of collecting and publishing all the historical papers in the capitol. Bevan began his work with enthusiasm, visited England in connection with it, and then died. In 1837 the legislature authorized the appointment of an agent to secure copies in Great Britain of the records relating to Georgia, and Charles Wallace Howard was appointed. He spent two years in England, and at an expense of about \$7,000 brought back twenty-two

³⁰ Salley, "Preservation of South Carolina History," in *loc. cit.*

³¹ Theodore H. Jack, "The Preservation of Georgia History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, IV (1927), 240.

large volumes of transcripts of great historical significance. These were used by Stevens, White, and Jones, and doubtless would have been used by many later investigators, but for the fact that, lent by the secretary of state to Henry A. Scomp, of Oxford, then writing a work entitled *King Alcohol in the Realm of King Cotton*, they were destroyed by fire in his house.³²

To Florida belongs the distinction of never losing a capitol and of paying much less attention to her records than any southern state. Records were poorly kept and quite as poorly preserved. The coal bin and the garret alike were repositories of many that were made.³³

Alabama records, like those of Georgia, were peripatetic. The first capital was St. Stephens. Then Huntsville served temporarily until suitable buildings could be erected at Cahaba. In 1826, six years after they were moved to Cahaba, they were carried to Tuscaloosa where they remained until 1846, when they made their supposedly last trek. Packed in 113 boxes, they rode to the new capitol at Montgomery, where most of them were burned three years later when the building was destroyed. Again, in 1865, when the records were moved from Montgomery in advance of Wilson's raid and carried to Eufaula, and some even to Augusta, there was heavy loss on each step of the trip.³⁴

Mississippi records have fared better, though they, too, moved frequently. During the Civil War, part of the records were moved to Meridian, then to Enterprise, Columbus, and Macon, then to the penitentiary in Jackson, and finally back to the capitol. In 1863 Federal troops occupied the capitol and much of what had been left was destroyed. On the whole the state is fortunate in what has survived.³⁵

Louisiana had eleven changes of capital between 1722 and the close

³² *Ibid.*, 239-51.

³³ James A. Robertson, "The Preservation of Florida History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, IV (1927), 352.

³⁴ Mitchell B. Garrett, "The Preservation of Alabama History," in *ibid.*, V (1928), 3-19; "Report of Public Archives Commission," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1904 (Washington, 1905), 493-95.

³⁵ The territorial and state capitals were, successively, "Old Concord"; Natchez in 1819; Washington, 1820; Columbia, 1821; and Jackson since 1823. Dunbar Rowland, *First Annual Report, Department of Archives and History of Mississippi* (Jackson, 1902); William H. Weathersby, "The Preservation of Mississippi History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, V (1928), 141-50.

of the period under consideration.⁸⁶ She has had only one capitol fire, but a disastrous one—when the Federal troops burned Baton Rouge in 1862. The destruction of the capitol was accompanied by the loss of most of the state records and those of the Louisiana Historical Society. Through the assistance of Lyman C. Draper, a considerable portion of the unburned archives owned by the Historical Society were later recovered from the widow of a Federal officer. Returned to Baton Rouge, they were speedily forgotten; but when Tulane University was founded they were sent there, stored in an attic and again forgotten, until they were rescued and brought to light by Colonel William Preston Johnston.⁸⁷

The archives of Texas suffered the usual losses prior to the Civil War, the most serious one occurring when the office of the adjutant general burned in 1855 with irreplaceable records of the early days of Texas and those of the army and navy of the Republic. In 1881 the capitol burned, but very few records were lost.⁸⁸

Arkansas archives have suffered, in the words of one closely familiar with their history, from "carelessness, the fortunes of war, and the lack of store room." On the Federal capture of Little Rock in 1863, the capital was moved to Washington and some of the archives were moved there by wagon. It was reported that when paper became scarce some of the record books were used in making cartridges. Some not thus used probably were never returned to Little Rock. By the opening of the twentieth century some of the offices had become so crowded that, in desperation, officials dumped out some of the archives and sold them to a dealer to be shipped to a paper mill.⁸⁹

Tennessee records suffered heavily through the movement of the capital. This moving, combined with carelessness, ignorance, and indifference, contributed to the destruction. The state house never burned, but

⁸⁶ They were: Biloxi, 1699; Mobile, 1701; New Biloxi, 1719; New Orleans, 1722; Donaldsonville, 1825; New Orleans, 1831; Baton Rouge, 1850; Opelousas and Shreveport, 1862; New Orleans, 1862; Baton Rouge, 1879.

⁸⁷ Grace King, "The Preservation of Louisiana History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, V (1928), 363-71.

⁸⁸ Charles W. Ramsdell, "The Preservation of Texas History," in *ibid.*, VI (1929), 1-16.

⁸⁹ David Y. Thomas, "The Preservation of Arkansas History," in *ibid.*, V (1928), 263-74.

the archives, many of them, moved from pillar to post, packed into the basement of the building, "piled in masses on the stone floors among old paint barrels, ashes, trash of every description, dirt, and grime," grew wet, rotted, and many were burned because the janitor thought them "nasty" and they "smelled bad."⁴⁰ Many were sold as waste paper. Hunters for stamps and autographs wrought their wicked will among them. Altogether it is the saddest story among the fourteen I am endeavoring to tell.⁴¹

Kentucky has been one of the unlucky states as regards fire. Her capitol burned in 1813 and in 1824; the secretary's office in 1865; and during the Goebel-Taylor struggle, when troops occupied the capitol, they made beds of archival manuscripts and lighted pipes with them, not even pausing to economize by making allumettes.⁴²

And, to complete the dreary record, Missouri lost her capitol by fire in 1837, losing her most valuable archives, and repeated the performance in 1911.

The story is as bad, perhaps worse, with respect to local records. Every state has had many and disastrous courthouse fires. The figures are not obtainable, but the facts are well known. For example, North Carolina has had fifty-four courthouse fires; Arkansas, thirty-five; South Carolina, after considerable loss by accidental fires, was to have, during the Civil War, a major calamity when several of the Low Country counties moved their records to Columbia for safety. Virginia counties have suffered terribly. From various causes—fire, water, enemy invasion, and domestic carelessness—the early records of eight counties have been completely destroyed; those of fourteen have been partially destroyed; and still others have suffered heavily. Louisiana has had many courthouse fires, and the records in very few parishes go back as far as fifty years.

⁴⁰ Knoxville, Kingston, Knoxville again, Nashville, Knoxville, Murfreesboro, and then, from 1826, Nashville, have served as capitals. R. A. Halley, "The Preservation of Tennessee History," in *American Historical Magazine* (Nashville, 1896-1905), VIII (1903), 49-63.

⁴¹ Philip M. Hamer, "The Preservation of Tennessee History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, VI (1929), 127-39.

⁴² Irene T. Myers, "The Archives of Kentucky," in *American Historical Association, Annual Report*, 1910 (Washington, 1912), 336.

Fire and war account for much of the loss of county records, but the utter carelessness of their legal custodians must be regarded as more responsible. That carelessness has been almost incredible. Nor is it entirely a matter of the distant past. I myself have seen in several states records historically valuable beyond calculation rotting in the basements and being eaten by rats in the attics of courthouses. I once rescued eight volumes of colonial county court records from a mass of papers already destined to destruction by county officials. Another time I received a message from a county official in a state not my own, that if I would notify him in advance and come with two trucks he would fill them with pre-Civil War records. It is scarcely necessary, I hope, to say that the invitation was not accepted.

Perhaps the most startling example of official carelessness is the case where the chief of the fire department in a southern capital ordered the burning of a very large accumulation of boxes and bundles of papers on the floor of a basement room of the capitol. They proved to be personal manuscript material, sent in over a number of years to the state department having charge of manuscripts. These cases are undocumented for obvious reasons, but they are facts. They form part of a vast amount of confidential, "Hush-Hush" information of which I have been made the repository during years of manuscript hunting.

Such in brief is the story of public records. Let us examine briefly the story of private and personal ones, as well—those human documents which, not less important than public archives, are far more living and fascinating than archival material can ever be, and which serve to clothe the skeletons of public records with flesh and blood, as it were, and to breathe into their nostrils the breath of life.

The same seemingly relentless fate that has overtaken much of southern archival material has pursued personal records of every kind, and with even greater success. It could not be otherwise. The repositories for public archives were inadequate; there were none for private papers other than individual homes. Public buildings burned frequently; private dwellings practically always.⁴³ Invading armies, whether in the heat

⁴³ There are innumerable places in the South known to have been the site for as many as four or five houses.

of battle or in the calmer and more dangerous throes of hate, were much more likely to destroy residences than capitols and courthouses. While public officers were usually incompetently and ignorantly careless of records, some realized their importance; but nobody was responsible for private papers and, except in the case of those of outstandingly great men, no one thought them of any importance. Even when cared for as part of the *lares* and *penates* of a home and family, eventually a godless generation would let them be destroyed.

For an example, take the case of the papers of Colonel Theodorick Bland, a distinguished Virginian of the Revolutionary period. Colonel Bland died in 1790, leaving no children. His widow, twice remarried, died in France, and the home and his papers became the property of the nephew of her second husband, who took no interest in them or care of them. In consequence, he had "fulminated upon his head certain inverted blessings" by John Randolph, who sought vainly to get the papers for preservation.

The Cawson's house, in which the manuscripts were stored, burned down. "An apartment to which they were afterward removed, from age actually rotted down underneath them. At another period the papers . . . were deposited in the mouldy damp of a cellar, tossed in a heap together pell-mell. The next translation they underwent was to a carriage-house or barn." The first intimation of their continued existence came through the finding by the owner of a neighboring place of a letter of George Washington on the bottom of a bucket of eggs.⁴⁴

About 1833 Charles Campbell, happening to hear of the existence of some papers of Colonel Bland at Cawson's, met the lady of the house, who, when he inquired about them, "very obligingly reached down a bundle of letters of divers revolutionary worthies, from the interstices of the eaves of the porch, where they were nicely pigeon-holed." A Negro boy then led him to "a small, new-built out-house in one corner of the yard, wherein, on opening the door, was found a capacious wooden chest, full to the brim of manuscripts One of the first my eye

⁴⁴ For a quotation from a New York newspaper, giving an account of this discovery, see Charles Campbell (ed.), *The Bland Papers*, 2 vols. (Petersburg, 1840-1843), I, ix, note.

lit on was a letter, on an ample sheet, from General Washington, dated at Cambridge, Mass. The manuscripts were (many of them) mouse-nibbled, rat-eaten, stained, torn and faded; and they certainly breathed anything but 'Sabeian odors from the spicy shore of Araby the blest'." How familiar it all sounds!

Campbell, in spite of "a wish to revisit the place," shortly afterward left Virginia with the wish ungratified, and remained away for several years. From Alabama he wrote the secretary of the Virginia Historical Society and Edmund Ruffin about them. Ruffin obtained a basket of the papers, but examined them only briefly and kept them until Campbell's return. After some arrangement of them, and after a plan to publish them had failed, Campbell, too, put them aside. "The old papers were now consigned to the drawers of an antiquated bureau, up three flights of stairs, and there allowed to repose." Later, Campbell found some more at Cawson's. From these came the well-known Bland Papers, very valuable historically, but only a fragment of those which Colonel Bland left behind him.

Private papers, too, were beset by dangers unknown to archives. To begin with, social history, which relies so heavily on ordinary letters, is essentially a comparatively modern development. To a majority of southerners of an older day the thought of personal family letters being in a library, exposed to the eyes of outsiders, was a horrible one; nor is that point of view unknown in these more enlightened days. As a matter of fact and of personal reminiscence, I can recall a number of occasions when I suspect that only the obligations of hospitality were all that prevented the dogs from being loosed on me! Dr. William P. Palmer, in the introduction to his *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, indicates that he had experienced similar difficulty. "It cannot be amiss to refer to the persistence with which private individuals retain in their possession valuables, which, with mistaken pride, they keep constantly exposed to the common accidents of life. This has been a fruitful cause of loss."⁴⁵

⁴⁵ William P. Palmer, Sherwin McRea, *et al* (eds.), *Calendar of Virginia State Papers and Other Manuscripts* [1652-1869], 11 vols. (Richmond, 1875-1893), I, xx. In the same connection, Palmer also said: "The abodes of the numerous patrician class, who so long inhabited ancestral homes scattered over Virginia, from Arlington House and Hungar's,

Perhaps worse than any other single scourge has been the mistress of the house, obsessed with a horror of "trash" and bent upon its destruction. Candor compels the admission, however, that frequently she has been aided and abetted by members of the other sex, who, if for no other reason than that difference, ought to have known better. And, finally, there was the cause, referred to by Moses Coit Tyler in 1886 as common to the whole country,

. . . that the private papers left by men in public life, which would in after time become of confidential, delicate, and priceless value in the study of events touched by these men's careers, should be negligently kept by their descendants or heirs, or as negligently dispersed, or left to destruction through the assaults of accident. American society is composed of more movable elements than was the case even in the Colonial time. We have few examples of families maintained through several generations in the same houses; our homes are of combustible material; and our habits are those of recklessness as to fires. The result of our present social conditions is that the kinds of historical documents now referred to, if retained in private custody, are peculiarly liable to neglect, and even to destruction.⁴⁶

In the South, a rural region, sparsely settled, this danger was certainly intensified.

The result of it all is known to everyone who has ever attempted to carry on investigation in southern history. Because of it, innumerable interesting and important southern characters in American history are virtually unknown as persons; they are merely names. Many are not even names. What Milton, in the *Areopagitica*, said of the destruction of a book applies with greater force to the destruction of those documents

on the Eastern Shore, to Temple-farm on the Western; from the region about Green-spring and Stafford house, to Green-way court, the extreme limit of the Northern neck; and from Bacon-castle and Varina, to the cliffs of Tuckahoe and Dungeness, must have abounded with historical material, accumulated through the correspondence and diaries kept by their intelligent occupants. Many of the latter, it should be remembered, were connected by ties of blood, with influential families in the old country. Others having occupied important posts under the government, had established intimate relations with leading men of state, and had maintained familiar intercourse with their friends abroad. In the course of their correspondence, matters of public concern, were not only discussed, but in the scarcity of printed newspapers, their letters abounded with incidents of private history, and recorded the current news and talk of the day. . . . Even at this late day, there are doubtless remaining in the lofts of old mansions, and in the possession of descendants of those who once occupied others long since passed away, many valuable papers now regarded as worthless rubbish." *Ibid.*, xviii.

⁴⁶ *Papers of the American Historical Association*, 5 vols. (New York, 1886-1891), II, 20-21.

which reveal the thoughts, aspirations, and plans of human beings as they lived their lives rather than wrote books.⁴⁷ William Palmer, much later, evidently so thought: "The loss of a single manuscript is often a sort of literary homicide; it is the utter and irremediable destruction of an author."⁴⁸

When we call a roll of men distinguished in the life of the South, we find that only a few have correspondence and other papers surviving. For every one whose personal papers have been preserved, dozens can be counted whose papers cannot be found. It is understandable for characters of the colonial and Revolutionary periods, and of some, even many, of later periods; but it is none the less regrettable. We have had so much to say of our pride in and our devotion to the memory of the Confederacy that it is a somewhat startling fact there remain today papers of only a handful of the men to whom the South turned in the fateful days of 1860-1861, during the years of war, and in those later years, even harder in many respects, that we know as Reconstruction. The hundreds of men who constituted the secession conventions, the Confederate cabinet, Congress, and judiciary; the generals; and the members of the constitutional conventions (so-called) which followed the war, all together have left behind only a pitiful fragment of the important papers they must have owned. Some unreconstructed denizen of the region north of the Mason and Dixon line might be pardoned for believing that this is a part of a just retribution for their sins!

Harsh years of poverty and of readjustment following the war account in part for this situation, but the lack of care by their families in later years accounts for much more. The papers belonged to them legally, it is true, but I think all historians will agree with me in denying their moral right to destroy such vital records as those we know they did destroy. And on the foundation of our knowledge we can safely erect an even vaster edifice of imagination or suspicion. Why, for ex-

⁴⁷ "And yet, unless wariness be us'd, as good almost kill a Man as kill a good Booke; who kills a Man kills a reasonable creature, God's image; but he who destroyes a good Booke, kills reason itself, kills the Image of God, as it were in the eye. Many a man lives a burden to the Earth; but a good Booke is the pretious life-blood of a master spirit, imbalmd and treasur'd up on purpose to a life beyond life."

⁴⁸ *Calendar of Virginia State Papers*, I, x.

ample, should the papers of one of the two Confederate admirals have been fed to the fire over two whole winters, and those of the other left in a garret after the house was sold? Why should the papers of two of the most distinguished southern naval officers, one of the United States and the other of the Confederate navy, have been deliberately burned by the nephew of one who was also the son of the other? Was the consignment to the flames of a diary kept by the New England wife of an important member of the Confederate administration in Richmond—a superbly critical and clever picture of the Confederate government and capital—justifiable otherwise than in legality? We have to regard the burning of a house or its destruction by flood as one of the changes and chances of this mortal life, and I suppose we must include such quasi “acts of God” as the destruction of records by rats and mice; but we can be pardoned for any judgment we may form of those who store in cellar, barn, or corncrib—or, worse still, burn—the papers of ancestors, whether distinguished or undistinguished, for all have value equally in the sight of God and the historian.

I could multiply these cases indefinitely, but why? All southern historians probably have—or should have—their own list of offenders ready should some day the southern historical world decide to get revenge for all these crimes and injuries by setting up its own Hall of Infamy. Hening bitterly reproached the “myrmidons” of George III, who “with more than the savage barbarity of the Goths and Vandals committed to the flames” Virginia records. Dean William R. Inge was more just in his observation: “Ancient civilization fell by the invasion of barbarians. We breed our own.” And so every one who knows the whole story will realize that our own people have destroyed a large part of what we may call our own Alexandrine Library.

Perhaps it is sound philosophy to realize that while ignorance of law is not a valid excuse for its violation, it can be so regarded in other fields than law. Perhaps we should agree with the statement of Worthington C. Ford that “Until recently we have done our best to destroy what we have, and should be profoundly grateful that even a part remains.” But all who profess to have a special interest in the history of the South will share the guilt of any destruction that may hereafter occur if they lose

an opportunity to inform the manuscript-holding population of its duty in the premises. But in the light of experience, some of it acquired since I began to plan this paper, I can confidently prophesy that however gifted many may be as teachers they will fail hopelessly in the effort. The best we can hope for, as is the case in much of human attempts at instruction, is far from our ideal.

It must of course be remembered that not all of the destruction and other loss of southern documents can be attributed to natives or residents of the South. Dwellings in countless numbers were burned by Federal troops, and others were completely ransacked. As has already been mentioned, the papers in the various state houses that were occupied by Federal troops were stolen or destroyed in huge quantities. Innumerable courthouses suffered similarly. No year passes that some of the stolen papers do not turn up at auction sales or elsewhere. Benson J. Lossing gathered from returned soldiers a mass of such material, part of which was claimed after his death by the state of Virginia. They were finally withdrawn from sale, and, according to the latest evidence I have on the subject, are still held for some future final settlement.

The document of this sort that attracted the widest attention was the will of Martha Washington. A Federal colonel, whose headquarters were in the Fairfax County courthouse, found his men feeding county records to a stove; and on finding the will among the papers which remained, took possession of it. After his death his daughter sold it to the elder J. P. Morgan. In 1908, the board of county supervisors, having learned of its whereabouts, twice requested its return, but received no reply. After the death of Morgan a local chapter of the Daughters of the American Revolution, in a letter endorsed by the county clerk, requested its return, but J. P. Morgan, Jr., who had inherited it, declined to return it. A bill was then passed by the legislature instructing the governor to make a formal demand for its return, and the attorney general was authorized, in the event of a refusal, to bring suit in the Supreme Court of the United States for its recovery.

An informal request was made by Governor Henry C. Stuart, and Morgan again refused, declaring that the document would not be safe from fire in Fairfax. He offered, however, to give it to Mount Vernon

if the will of George Washington should also be given; and as an alternative he made a similar proposal with respect to the Library of Congress. A personal interview between Governor Stuart and Morgan brought no agreement, and the formal demand of the state was then made. When no answer was received, suit was entered. Before the date when his answer to the complaint was due, Morgan sent a letter by Fairfax Harrison to the president of the Court of Appeals, stating that "eminent counsel" had assured him that the title of his father's estate to the will was "perfect and unassailable," but that rather than have the case tried he would return the will. The will was delivered with the letter, and finally was once more at home in Fairfax.⁴⁹

I have thus far dealt with a gloomy matter—destruction. Are there no cheering aspects of my subject? There are several such aspects, even in the period to which I have limited this discussion, as well as many in the years immediately following. In outline they are known to many of you and I shall deal with them only briefly.

Movements in the southern states looking to the preservation of records and making them available have taken several forms and have been directed toward both state and semi-public activity. In point of time, priority must be given to the latter type. In 1791 Massachusetts, the birthplace of so many fine movements—whatever we may, hereditarily

⁴⁹ The facts of this case are to be found in the *Annual Report of the Attorney General of Virginia*, 1916 (Richmond, 1917), 279-91. Mr. Morgan's letter contained the following interesting paragraph: "Should the case, however, come to trial, issues will be raised as to the late war and the status of participants therein, which, it seems to me, better should not be raised in view of the fifty years of peace and unity which have elapsed since the termination of the war. I do not wish that through any act of mine, differences long settled should be recalled. Rather than revive the memories of ancient strife, long since consigned to oblivion by the good sense and good feeling and patriotism of the people of the United States, I greatly prefer to waive such personal rights as I believe I have in this matter."

The *New York Times*, in various issues, made reference to the case. Commenting editorially, it took the view that the will could not be regarded as stolen property, expressing the opinion, as justification of the remarkable argument, that it would probably have been destroyed later if it had not been taken. It expressed its belief that "Morgan and Lossing probably did not know" that such southern papers were stolen, and that there was no proof that the will had been stolen. The editorial continued: "The Southern states were slack and slovenly in their guardianship of these relics in ante-bellum days. . . . When Union soldiers appeared at the various county seats they had a better appreciation of the value of what they found, and had no false modesty about appropriating these souvenirs as prizes of war." Issue of February 22, 1914.

or otherwise, think of some of them—and of so much forward-looking legislation, led the way toward one method by the establishment of the first, and in most respects the most successful, state historical society. In the Introductory Address of the Society are two striking sentences which should be read at every meeting of every historical society—general, state, or local—in the South:

Among the singular advantages which are enjoyed by the people of the United States none is more conspicuous than the facility of tracing the origins and progress of our plantations. . . . With such advantages in our hands, we are wholly inexcusable if we neglect to preserve authentic monuments of every memorable occurrence.

And for good measure the following extract from a letter of Jeremy Belknap to Ebenezer Hazard, about the same time, concerning the Society, might be added:

We intend to be an active, not a passive literary body; not to lie waiting, like a bed of oysters, for the tide of communication to flow in upon us, but to seek and find, to preserve and communicate literary intelligence, especially in the historical way.

Seven other northern states had also established such societies before any southern state followed the good example. The Virginia Historical Society was founded in 1831 and chartered three years later. It has led an active, honorable, and useful career since that time. The Historical Society of North Carolina was incorporated in 1833, but did not actually come into being until 1844, by which time Louisiana, Georgia, Kentucky, and Maryland had organized societies. Tennessee followed in 1849, Alabama in 1850, South Carolina in 1855, Florida in 1856, and Mississippi in 1858. After the Civil War, Missouri in 1866, Texas in 1897, and Arkansas in 1903, made the roll complete. But in actual fact some died a-borning and others later, and through many years there were numerous reorganizations and foundings of new societies to take their places. Only the Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina, Georgia, Texas, and Missouri societies lived on without resuscitation or replacement. Throughout the earlier period of their existence, the southern societies in most cases neglected their most fundamental function, namely, collecting source material and making it available to writers. They

were also notably, not to say criminally, careless with such material as they gathered, and a considerable portion was lost.

In no southern state have local societies in any number flourished, though innumerable ones have been founded only quickly to die. Where they gathered manuscripts and other historical material, it was usually lost. Encouraging exceptions have been the Filson Club, of Louisville, founded in 1884, and the Wachovia Historical Society of Salem, North Carolina.

Two notable contributions to the preservation of southern historical material deserve special attention. The first of these began in 1869, when a group of southern men, nearly all of whom had been conspicuous for service in the Confederacy, met in New Orleans and organized the Southern Historical Society, with General Jubal A. Early as president. The New Orleans organization was designed to be the parent of branches in all the southern states, but the plan did not work well, and in January, 1873, at Montgomery White Sulphur Springs, Virginia, a reorganization took place by which the home of the Society was moved to Richmond. In 1876 the publication of the *Southern Historical Society Papers* was commenced and, with several brief intervals, it has continued to the present. Through its forty-nine volumes a tremendous amount of source material in the form of records and reminiscences, as well as many secondary studies, has been preserved and made available. Its primary success was largely due to the passionate enthusiasm and devoted labors of Dr. J. William Jones, who served as secretary until 1886. His work was later carried on by Robert A. Brock, James Power Smith, and Harrison J. Eckenrode; and the president and moving spirit today is Douglas Southall Freeman.

The second came as a result of the discussions and conferences of a group of historically minded men in Washington, among whom may be mentioned General Marcus J. Wright, Thomas Nelson Page, Thomas M. Owen, Stephen B. Weeks, J. L. M. Curry, and Colyer Meriwether. A call for a meeting in Washington to organize a southern historical society, signed by ninety-five well-known men interested in history, was widely disseminated. On April 24, 1896, the meeting was held and the

Southern History Association was formally organized, with William L. Wilson as president and Colyer Meriwether as secretary. It struggled for eleven years against all the obstacles which confront such organizations, chief among them, of course, being lack of popular interest and of adequate support. Largely through the untiring labor and interest of Colyer Meriwether, aided greatly by Stephen B. Weeks and General Marcus J. Wright, eleven annual volumes of its *Publications* and one extra volume were printed. They contained much valuable source material, many significant articles, and a wealth of reviews and notes which cover adequately the course of historical work in the South until 1907, when they ceased. The Association, miraculously solvent, suspended at the same time.

The part played by collectors in connection with southern records has been both good and bad. The autograph collector, as such, has been, historically speaking, not only an unmitigated nuisance, but a positive menace as well. No other agency has been so responsible for the deliberate dispersal of manuscript collections, to say nothing of the destruction incident to their work. But there are other types of collectors, whose work has been highly beneficial. At the sale of the library of the Earl of Southampton, who had been president of the London Company, William Byrd purchased three large folio manuscript volumes which contained the minutes of the Company and a summary of the legislative and judicial acts of the colony of Virginia. Jefferson saved many invaluable Virginia records. Lyman Draper's collection is known to every student of American history, with its records of Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Tennessee, and Kentucky. A large part of its contents would undoubtedly have been lost or destroyed but for his work. Louise Kellogg imaginatively describes Draper's collecting career as follows:

Everywhere he was received with great cordiality; his mission was approved, his aims commended. In the isolated farmsteads of the Old Southwest his coming was an event. Earnest and enthusiastic himself, he inspired confidence in his hosts; they accepted his own estimate of his mission and saw in him the chosen vessel ordained to present the lives of the pioneers to the world. To them he was in fact the savior of pioneer history, the inspired prophet who should cause to rise again the dry bones from the valley of the past.

Every possible effort was made to assist him in his chosen work. Not only were memories ransacked, but from their hiding-places old letters and documents were brought forth and pressed into his hands. No thought arose as to either loan or gift. Here was the rescuer of their forefathers' fame; here was the apostle of the historic record. Everything must be put at his disposal to make his work authentic. The half-forgotten, neglected papers would most of them soon have perished had not this knight errant of historic adventure passed by that way. The donors felt themselves privileged to co-operate with one whom they recognized as a scholar, who was to make the names they bore glorious before the world.⁵⁰

A somewhat more realistic discussion of the collector, however, is the following comment by Worthington C. Ford:

I have a high admiration for the old-time collector, while thankful that the breed has died out. He took anything without perplexing his mind with questions of right or fitness. He thought nothing of borrowing from private and State offices, and training his memory to forget the fact of borrowing. His zeal was fed by his acquisitions, and while he started a church member in good standing he ended with a system of bookkeeping which gave a balance only in his favor. According to his lights he was correct in his position, for he sought to counteract the neglect of others, and in default of any other recognized custodian, he constituted himself master of the rolls. No doubt much has thus been saved which would otherwise have been lost, and for this he should have full credit. But much was also lost through his ignorance, lost actually and geographically, for what he got so cheaply he scattered with lavish hand and never appreciated the advantage of keeping great collections intact. A single autograph desired led him to break a series of letters, and never could the series be made good. His actions, entirely well intentioned, were unmoral, and rarely did he rise to so high a plane as to merit our gratitude unmixed with real regret that he should have been permitted to have his way.

In his blind and unmoral methods he represented the beginnings of the modern idea of preserving records; his methods, however, are directly opposed to this modern idea of preservation—truly a modern idea in this country, for it has come into application within the last 30 years. There is not in existence a private collection of size which does not contain documents easily recognized as public documents, drawn in some manner from some public source. No auction sale of autographs is held without a good sprinkling of state papers which have evidently strayed, and improperly, from their proper place of deposit. The romance of collecting is full of unexpected finds, but the romance of collecting is

⁵⁰ Louise P. Kellogg, "The Services and Collections of Lyman C. Draper," in *Wisconsin Magazine of History* (Madison, 1917-), V (1922), 256.

more than equaled in vivid interest by the sordid phase of obtaining by underhand methods what is desired.⁵¹

In a discussion of manuscript collectors, I cannot fail to take note of another type of collector in the recent past of the South, and recite the names of some of the notable pioneers in collecting for the cause of history—Saunders, Browne, Stanard, Tyler, Bruce, Owen, Connor, Salley, Rowland, Swem, Candler, Winkler, and Robinson. Their states, the South, and the nation are permanently richer for their work.

The southern states as well as the others were slow in waking to the importance of preserving records of the past and slower still in conceiving of the task as a duty and a responsibility of the state. Consequently, public record legislation, beyond routine provisions for keeping records, was long in coming. In nearly every case when action was taken, it was the result of the influence and efforts of a small group of public-spirited and historically minded men whose ceaseless appeals and powerful arguments finally prevailed over the indifference or, at best, listless inaction of politicians. Hening foresaw this in 1809 and wrote: "It is to the pious care of individuals only that posterity will be indebted for those lasting monuments."⁵² As we shall see, this continued to be the case throughout all the period under discussion.

A more successful movement was a somewhat later one to induce the states to take action with respect to archives. A large part of the important records of the original states, as well as of most of the later ones, are in Europe, and gradually efforts were made to procure copies of such records. New York led the way, when in 1814 the Historical Society called upon the state to save its records. As a result, agents were sent to England, Holland, and France, for copies of all records relating to the colony, and presently publication of the *Documentary History of New York* was commenced.

North Carolina was the first southern state to take similar action. Its legislature, in the session of 1826-1827, passed a resolution requesting the governor to make application to the British Government for per-

⁵¹ Worthington C. Ford, "Manuscripts and Historical Archives," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1913, 2 vols. (Washington, 1915), I, 77-78.

⁵² Hening (ed.), *Statutes at Large*, I, iv.

mission to procure for the state copies of all papers and documents in the office of the Board of Trade and Plantations that related to the colonial history of the state. The only immediate result was that the desired permission was obtained and an *Index to Colonial Documents Relative to North Carolina* was prepared. In 1831 the legislature grew excited about the discussion of a supposed Mecklenburg Declaration of Independence, and appointed a committee to investigate the subject with provision for printing their report. It also provided for printing the journal of the provincial congress of 1776 and some other Revolutionary material. The burning of the capitol later in the year tended to discourage the historical movement for some years.

In 1843 the "Index" was printed by the state, and in the following year Governor John M. Morehead recommended that an agent be sent to London to copy the papers. The suggestion was not followed, but important legislation looking to the preservation of valuable records in the state was enacted. The establishment of the Historical Society, David L. Swain's statement of its purposes,⁵³ and its success in securing valuable historical records, enabled Governor William A. Graham to make so strong a report to the legislature of 1846-1847 that it passed a resolution giving him very extended authority in the matter of publication of historical material. Nothing was published, but the succeeding legislature authorized the governor to expend a thousand dollars in procuring copies of the North Carolina records in England. Swain was appointed agent, and succeeding legislatures authorized an extensive program of printing, together with the expenditure of sufficient funds to send the agent to England and to have all the North Carolina records copied.

Work was actually begun when the Civil War intervened. The problems of war and later of Reconstruction were demanding and prevented the giving of much attention to records of the past. But the people emerged from the struggles of the period with a new vision and an enlarged conception of the meaning of history, and the task of those who sought to care for the past was never again so difficult. Through the

⁵³ For this statement of purposes, see *North Carolina Historical Review*, IV (1927), 6.

efforts of Colonel William L. Saunders and Governor Thomas J. Jarvis the legislature of 1881 was induced to pass a bill authorizing the publication of a body of colonial and Revolutionary records which had recently been found. The legislature of 1883 authorized the collection and inclusion of material not in the possession of the state, and Colonel Saunders was thus able to secure the services of W. Noel Sainsbury of the British Public Record Office and to obtain a mass of valuable records.⁵⁴

The result was the compilation and publication of the *Colonial Records*. Into them, Colonel Saunders as editor, who had for his monumental task no other equipment than a fine mind, capacity for unrelenting toil, and unbounded love for his state, and who was so crippled by rheumatism and wounds that most of his time was spent either in bed or in a wheel chair, suffering intense pain almost all the time, put eleven years of his life, and died as the task was completed. The work then stopped for a time, but Judge Walter Clark succeeded to the editorship and through his industry, interest, and ability the sixteen volumes of *State Records* were added.⁵⁵

In Virginia, Angus McDonald, acting under authority of the legislature, brought copies of important documents from England as early as 1859. The Civil War followed almost immediately, and for a good many years thereafter the state did nothing further toward the acquisition of copies of its early records or the preservation of those records it had. In a limited way the Historical Society continued its work, but in the 1870's the State Library began to procure transcripts from the Public Record Office. These were supplemented by the purchase of various collections of Virginia records. In 1892 the legislature appropriated \$5,000 to be expended in copying the county records previous to 1700, and under this act forty-one large volumes containing copies of records

⁵⁴ J. G. de Roulhac Hamilton, "The Preservation of North Carolina History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, IV (1927), 3-10. Governor Jarvis, in an address to the North Carolina Literary and Historical Association, gave a delightful account of how all this came about.

⁵⁵ See Weeks, "Historical Review of the Colonial and State Records of North Carolina," in *loc. cit.*

of eleven ancient counties were prepared.⁵⁶ Later, an elaborate program of publication was undertaken by the State Library, but the greater part of that work was done later than the period of this study.

The legislature of Maryland took a highly important step in 1882. The records of the state had been reported on at intervals from 1722, and in 1835 the Ridgely report had described them as stored in "dis-used offices, cupboards, underneath the staircases, . . . the lofts, the cellars, and even the stairway to the dome." It told of finding "the remains of two large sea-chests and one box which had contained records and files of papers which were in a state of total ruin."⁵⁷ Their condition had not been greatly improved since. In 1847 the state had made the Historical Society custodian of a considerable body of records, and by the act of 1882 it was made the custodian of all records of Maryland prior to 1783, and the necessary appropriation for publication was provided.

Much had already been lost other than by fire. "Many early Maryland documents seem to have disappeared in connection with the researches of Scharf, the historian of the State. The notable collections of Peter Force and Joseph [Jared?] Sparks appear, however, to have been enriched in the same way."⁵⁸ In addition to the manuscript material thus secured, the Society during the next few years obtained transcripts from the Public Record Office of all the Maryland papers down to 1668, and a volume containing copies of the laws from 1649 to 1676. It also recovered some important records that had been sold for waste paper, and the Council Journals of 1692-1693, which had been given to the Mercantile Library Association. It then began the publication of the *Archives of Maryland*, which has continued ever since.

The evil fate of Georgia's copies of its records has already been mentioned. From 1837 almost to the very end of the century "the State, as

⁵⁶ The counties are: Accomac, Charles City, Elizabeth City, Essex, Henrico, Northampton, Rappahannock, Richmond, Surry, Warwick, and York. See Lyon G. Tyler, "Preservation of Virginia History," in *North Carolina Historical Review*, III (1926), 529-30.

⁵⁷ William H. Browne *et al.* (eds.) *Archives of Maryland* (Baltimore, 1883-), I (1883), vi.

⁵⁸ "Report of the Public Archives Commission," in American Historical Association, *Annual Report*, 1900, 2 vols. (Washington, 1901), II, 19.

such, gave little further heed to this problem. . . . During this long period of three-quarters of a century, not a single legislative act was passed looking to the preservation of the records; and in this same time not only were the records of the immediate past not being properly safeguarded and preserved, but the priceless papers of an earlier day were being rapidly lost, destroyed, or allowed to deteriorate." Nobody was charged with their preservation, and priceless documents were stored in basements to rot or to be used for lighting fires.⁵⁹ The only redeeming feature in the historical situation of the state was the Georgia Historical Society. With limited means, with a small membership, in a state which lacked any interest in history, but fortunately in an historic community, justly proud of its past, it kept the torch alight.

In 1885 provision was made by law for the compilation of a roster of Georgia troops in the Civil War, but not until the very end of the century was any forward step taken. Then under the leadership of Governor Allen D. Candler, who, as secretary of state, had discovered the condition of the records and had become keenly anxious for their salvation, something was accomplished. His urgent recommendations to the legislature bore fruit. The office of compiler of state records was created and Candler upon leaving the governorship was appointed to it, charged with the editing and publication of the state's colonial, Revolutionary, and Confederate records.⁶⁰

As has been seen, South Carolina, as judged by her legislation, throughout the colonial period was forward-looking as well as backward-looking with respect to records. She continued to be so during the period of statehood. In 1800 provision was made for indexing records and, in the following year, for procuring suitable cases in which to keep them. In 1804 an act was passed to compel all persons having papers of the recently abolished county courts to turn them in to the district courts of ordinary. A few years later nearly \$15,000 was paid for copying of old records in order to save them, and through the years up to the Civil War considerable sums were expended for filing cases, arranging, and indexing. During this period the state bore part of the expense of pub-

⁵⁹ Jack, "The Preservation of Georgia History," in *loc. cit.*, 243.

⁶⁰ See *ibid.*, 245-46, for an excellent description of Candler's work on this project.

lishing John Drayton's *Memoirs of the American Revolution* (2 vols., Charleston, 1821), Bartholomew R. Carroll's *Historical Collections of South Carolina* (2 vols., New York, 1836), Robert W. Gibbes' *Documentary History of the American Revolution* (3 vols., New York, 1853-1857), and the first three volumes of the *Collections* of the South Carolina Historical Society. In the case of Gibbes, the bread cast upon the waters returned with generous increase, for he gave the state the original documents which he had spent many years in collecting.

In 1849 the legislature authorized the appointment of an agent for "the collecting, arranging, and indexing of the records which relate to the Colonial and Revolutionary history of South Carolina," and as a result, many papers were found in the various offices and progress was made in arranging them. Interestingly enough, a movement begun in 1850 to construct a fire-proof building for the preservation of records led to the construction of a new state house. A committee appointed to make plans reported in 1851:

The Legislature will remember that at the last session it was agreed that the sales of lots in the town of Columbia, shall be placed at the disposal of the Committee, for the purpose of erecting the basement story of a fireproof building, for the deposit of the Records of the State.

The Committee, after great deliberation, have determined to erect the said building as a part of a plan which might be used as a State House.

The general assembly approved the plan and authorized the construction of the building, which was so impressive, though incomplete, that Sherman spared it and invaluable records were thus saved.⁶¹

Even during the Civil War South Carolina enacted legislation providing for preservation of the records of the Palmetto Regiment in Mexico, and passed the first of a long series of acts designed to secure for the state complete records of its part in the war which was then raging. And in 1894 the Historical Commission of the State of South Carolina was created, "to procure such documents or transcripts of documents and such other material relating to the history of South Carolina as they may deem necessary or important." By it forty large manuscript

⁶¹ Salley, "Preservation of South Carolina History," in *loc. cit.*, 145-57.

volumes of transcripts of South Carolina documents were procured from the British Public Record Office, most of which are still unpublished.

When we consider how cursed Charleston and the Low Country have been by invading armies and by earthquake, tempest, flood, and fire, it is little short of miraculous that so large a proportion of their records have been preserved.

The preservation and care of Texas records have been the joint work of the state and the University of Texas, most of their activity having occurred later than the time covered here. The state's part of the work has been done largely through the State Library. In 1898 the University of Texas acquired the Bexar Archives in 300,000 folios, to which it has added 70,000 transcripts. Thousands of documents in the United States and abroad have also since been copied by photostat or microfilm, and the acquisition of the Genaro Garcia Collection, also in later years, should not be overlooked.⁶²

Mississippi, likewise in the later period, secured twenty-two volumes of transcripts from England, thirty-two from France, and nine from Spain.⁶³ Very few of these have been published.

Although provision was made in the Louisiana Purchase for the transfer of the French and Spanish archives of the territory, it was discovered later that when the Spanish regime came to an end the records were looted and the larger part of those of the Spanish period taken to Havana and Pensacola. Those at Pensacola were later destroyed by fire, and that or some similar fate probably overtook those at Havana. Many of the French records also disappeared. When François Xavier Martin was preparing to write his *History of Louisiana*, he found in Paris and used extensively the "Archives de la Marine," which contained all the most important records concerning the discovery and colonization of Louisiana. As Grace King says: "It is to him, writing in full comprehension of the history of the state, that we are indebted today for all that we possess of the archives of Louisiana."

Judge Charles E. A. Gayarré was probably chiefly instrumental in inducing the legislature in 1847 to appropriate \$2,000 to procure docu-

⁶² Ramsdell, "The Preservation of Texas History," in *loc. cit.*, 1-16.

⁶³ Weathersby, "The Preservation of Mississippi History," in *loc. cit.*, 148.

ments from Spain. The agent employed, Pascual de Gayangos, went to Seville and Madrid, and after great difficulty secured a thousand pages of manuscript in two quarto volumes, prepared by Felix Magne of New Orleans, then residing in Paris. Gayarré was also largely responsible for the temporary revival of the comatose Historical Society, and actively associated with him in this interest were Benjamin F. French, who compiled the well-known *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, and Edmond Forstall. Gayarré, secretary of state at the time, was working to procure copies of the Louisiana archives in Spain when he ceased to hold office, but he personally obtained documents for his *Spanish Domination*. Forstall and John Perkins, commissioned by the Historical Society to make investigations in France, arranged with Pierre Margry for transcripts of all the Louisiana records in the "Archives de la Marine."⁶⁴

Just before and after the end of the nineteenth century, nearly every one of the southern states had become sufficiently historically minded to make the most important step yet taken for the future organized care of their records—both public archives and personal manuscripts. This was the establishment, with more or less adequate support, of departments of archives and history, or historical commissions, acting through directors or secretaries. In this new venture, Alabama led the way in 1901 under the guidance of Thomas M. Owen. Mississippi followed the next year, and Georgia took a definite step in the same direction. North Carolina in 1903, South Carolina in 1905, Virginia in 1906, Texas and Arkansas in 1909, Maryland in 1935, and Florida in 1941, complete the list. Missouri put its archival responsibilities in the hands of the State Historical Society, and Kentucky has taken a short step in the same direction. In Louisiana the Historical Society, thanks largely to the inspiration of the late Henry P. Dart, has been increasingly active, and the University has established a vigorous department of archives with state sanction and support. In 1900 the Public Archives Commission said that "The Southern States have done relatively much less than the others in this direction." Thirteen years later Worthington C. Ford was able to

⁶⁴ King, "The Preservation of Louisiana History," in *loc. cit.*, 363-71. See also, Benjamin F. French (ed.), *Historical Collections of Louisiana*, 5 vols. (New York, Philadelphia, 1846-1853), II, 8-11.

say: "Yet in spite of this drawback the history of the South and of Southern men is taking a form which promises good results, and every one of the original Southern States is doing more to make what it has available for history than is my own State of Massachusetts."⁶⁵

It is not within the province of this paper to discuss the developments of the past thirty-five years, but it is not amiss to say that they have done much to put a better taste in the historical mouth. There has been much education of the southern people with respect to the value of records. Great masses of them have been saved and made available to historical investigators. State agencies, universities, and historical societies co-operate in the patriotic task of perpetuating the story of our past.

Yes, we have come far on the road to reform, but we can travel faster and farther. It is not enough merely to provide the safe homes for manuscript material and gather it in when found. We must continue to educate the people of the South until they realize the value of documentary material. Nearly half a century ago William P. Trent, in an address at Vanderbilt University, humorously related a southern happening. It would be gratifying to think that it was characteristic only of a bygone period. Not so; it can be matched again and again in the recent past. It was then, and is only to a less degree today, in accord with what used to be called "good Southern tradition." The story follows:

A certain Georgia lawyer, whose name is not given, wrote an account of some stirring scenes in his State's early history. He died before his monograph was published. Two brother lawyers of high standing were appointed his executors. They approached the delicate task of apportioning the estate among the several heirs and things went on swimmingly for a time, until they came to the testator's manuscript. Here a difficulty arose. It could not be divided. To publish it would be an unheard of extravagance. It could not be left to become a bone of contention among the heirs. What then did these erudite lawyers, men who could have defended with great zeal and eloquence the institution of slavery or the practice of duelling, do with this manuscript? They burned it.⁶⁶

May it be the happy fortune of the Southern Historical Association speedily to make such happenings matters merely of tradition and no longer of practice.

⁶⁵ Ford, "Manuscripts and Historical Archives," in *loc. cit.*, 79.

⁶⁶ William P. Trent, "The Study of Southern History," in Vanderbilt Southern History Society, *Publications* (Nashville, 1895-1900), I (1895), 23-24.

James R. Chalmers and "Mahoneism" in Mississippi

BY (MISS) WILLIE D. HALSELL

"The name of Republican is as offensive in Mississippi as the name of Copperhead in Massachusetts . . . and will never become more popular unless some new issue should arise to popularize it hereafter," wrote James R. Chalmers, of Mississippi, to President Chester A. Arthur in December, 1882. But, he continued, "the Greenbackers and Independent Democrats of Mississippi have shown a determination to accomplish what the administration desires," that is, the defeat of the Democrats, "and the administration cannot secure this so easily or surely as through the aid of these men in Mississippi."¹ Thus Chalmers, a leader of Mississippi Independent Democrats,² diagnosed the political situation. And he evidently persuaded Republican leaders in Washington to accept, however tentatively, his prescription for Democratic defeat.

The inspiration for Chalmers' plan and probably the chief reason for immediate Republican approval was the success of Senator William Mahone, of Virginia, in fusing various political groups into the Readjuster party, which, under his leadership, dominated Virginia politics.³

¹ James R. Chalmers to President Chester A. Arthur, December [n.d.], 1882, in *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, April 11, 1883.

² The terms "Independent" and "Independent Democrat" were used interchangeably to designate former Democrats who for various reasons had withdrawn from the regular party organization and who acted independently of party policies.

³ Mahone was a former Confederate general and Democrat. After having been defeated for governor in the Virginia Democratic convention in 1877, he organized the Readjuster party on the debt readjustment issue. In 1881 a Readjuster governor, legislature, and United States senator were elected, and Mahone reached the height of his power in 1882 as senator, chairman of the state executive committee, and head of a strong party organization. He showed how the solid South could be broken up, but he was unable to maintain the breach. After 1882 he won no more elections. Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.),

Mahone, because of his desertion of party, corrupt political manipulation, prostitution of office,⁴ and attempt to break up the solid South, was hated by the southern Democrats, and to them the term "Mahoneism" was one of opprobrium. James R. Chalmers chose a role in Mississippi similar to Mahone's in Virginia.

Chalmers had been for more than twenty-five years preceding 1882 a fervent and orthodox Democrat.⁵ He was a member of the ante-bellum slaveholding aristocracy of North Mississippi, an able organizer and general in the Confederate Army, and an active participant in the defeat of carpetbag government in the state. Events leading to his change of party affiliation had occurred when he was congressman during the years 1881 and early 1882. First disputing the party domination of Senator Lucius Q. C. Lamar and his followers, Chalmers had allied himself with Ethelbert Barksdale, editor of the most powerful Democratic newspaper in the state and leader of various dissatisfied groups in the Democratic party. This revolt had proved costly, however, since Barksdale was defeated in his efforts to obtain first the senatorship and then the governor's office; and, as a result, he and Chalmers had found themselves in extreme disfavor with the victorious Lamar Democrats.⁶

At the same time, Chalmers, who had run for Congress in 1880 against the Negro, John R. Lynch,⁷ in the predominantly black shoe-string district, had a contested election on his hands. Chalmers expected Senator Lamar to defend his claim when it was debated in Congress,

Dictionary of American Biography, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XII, 211-12. For a detailed biography of Mahone, see Nelson M. Blake, *William Mahone of Virginia: Soldier and Political Insurgent* (Richmond, 1935).

⁴ Allen W. Moger, "The Origin of the Democratic Machine in Virginia," in *Journal of Southern History* (Baton Rouge, 1935-), VIII (1942), 185; Charles C. Pearson, *The Readjuster Movement in Virginia* (New Haven, 1917).

⁵ The best available biographical sketch of Chalmers is in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi, Comprising Sketches of Counties, Towns, Events, Institutions, and Persons, Arranged in Cyclopedic Form*, 4 vols. (Atlanta, 1907), I, 390-91. See also, *Dictionary of American Biography*, III, 593-94, and *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927* (Washington, 1928), 798.

⁶ Macon *Mississippi Sun*, May 12, 1882; Jackson (Miss.) *Weekly Clarion*, May 17, 1882. For details of this party struggle, see Willie D. Halsell, "Democratic Dissensions in Mississippi, 1878-1882," in *Journal of Mississippi History* (Jackson, 1939-), II (1940), 123-35.

⁷ For a brief sketch of Lynch, see *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 1246.

but Lamar, and possibly other Mississippi congressmen, failed to give him the support he anticipated.⁸ Further fuel was added to the fire when the Mississippi legislature made alterations in the congressional districts as a result of the census of 1880. In Chalmers' district, four densely populated counties to the south were dropped and two thinly settled counties at the north end were added. Chalmers pondered the situation and concluded that the "ridiculously grotesque" redistricting had been arranged by the "Lamar legislature" to punish him for opposing Lamar.⁹

When finally the contested seat in Congress was awarded to Lynch, Chalmers' anger and disappointment flared into open revolt. After he had interviewed Washington Republican leaders who made it their policy to aid the "liberal" Republican movements in the South,¹⁰ Chalmers announced in a letter to the Mississippi public his removal of residence from Vicksburg to his former home in Panola County in the Second Congressional District (where Senator Lamar also lived) and his candidacy as an Independent Democrat for Congress. He boldly charged that the Lamar Democrats had departed from the "true Democratic faith," and accused them of trying to throw him overboard "as a Jonah to the Republican whale."¹¹

Chalmers' letter announcing his withdrawal from the Mississippi Democracy was widely published in the state press. Democratic editors expressed amazement at his act, their most general pronouncement being that he had committed "political suicide."¹² He had dug his own grave as well, reasoned two editors, for no Negro would vote for a man who attempted to "usurp" John R. Lynch's seat, nor would a Democrat vote for a "disorganizer."¹³

⁸ Brookhaven (Miss.) *Ledger*, May 18, 1882; Vicksburg *Daily Commercial*, quoted in Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, April 5, 1882.

⁹ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, April 5, 1882.

¹⁰ Cincinnati *Commercial*, quoted in Jackson *Comet*, May 13, 1882.

¹¹ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, May 10, 17, 1882; Brookhaven *Ledger*, May 18, 1882.

¹² Macon *Mississippi Sun*, May 12, 1882; Macon *Beacon*, May 20, 1882; Memphis *Daily Appeal*, May 15, 16, 17, 1882; Brookhaven *Ledger*, May 18, 1882; Yazoo City (Miss.) *Yazoo Sentinel*, May 18, 1882.

¹³ Macon *Mississippi Sun*, May 12, 1882; Macon *Beacon*, May 27, 1882. The Atlanta *Constitution*, May 24, 1882, attacked Chalmers with a ferocity that indicated the attitude of southern Democrats toward party deserters. For the situation in Georgia, see Judson C. Ward, Jr., "The Republican Party in Bourbon Georgia, 1872-1890," in *Journal of Southern History*, IX (1943), 196-209.

Far more important to Chalmers, however, was the reception accorded him by the Mississippi Republicans, for on them depended his political future. The Republican party in the state was at that time, and had been for years, in a condition far removed from bliss. Chalmers himself described the situation within the party as "an unfortunate split,"¹⁴ but a member of the Republican Congressional Committee in Washington came nearer the truth when he said: "Miss. is the hot-bed of faction. . . . the feuds are deep and deadly."¹⁵

John R. Lynch, the Negro congressman to whom Chalmers had lost his seat, and James Hill,¹⁶ Negro collector of internal revenue in the state, practically controlled one wing of the Mississippi Republican party; they were assisted by a third Negro, Blanche K. Bruce,¹⁷ former Mississippi senator, who, from his position in the Treasury Department in Washington, was able to pull wires for Hill and Lynch.¹⁸ These three Negroes, who usually worked "in perfect political harmony," dominated the Mississippi Republican conventions, where either Bruce, Lynch, or Hill was chairman or floor manager, while Lynch monopolized the chairmanship of the state Republican committee from 1881 to 1889.¹⁹ Their party machinery was the federal department of internal revenue in Mississippi, Hill being the mainspring, and his deputies over the state the wheels and cogs.

It could hardly be expected, in view of the recent Chalmers-Lynch contest, as well as Chalmers' potential threat to black Republican control of the party, that the Negro faction would receive him eagerly. Indeed, Lynch promptly stated that he regarded Chalmers' "sudden" change as "rather suspicious." Lynch predicted that Chalmers would

¹⁴ Note written by Chalmers to William E. Chandler on letter from John T. Hull to Chalmers, December 29, 1882, in William E. Chandler Manuscripts (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress). Chandler was secretary of the navy at the time of this correspondence.

¹⁵ David B. Henderson to Chandler, July 4, 1882, in Willie D. Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi, 1882-1884," in *Journal of Southern History*, VII (1941), 92.

¹⁶ See *Who's Who in America . . . 1899-1900* (Chicago, 1899), 336.

¹⁷ Brief sketches of Bruce are to be found in *Dictionary of American Biography*, III, 180-81, and *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 750.

¹⁸ John R. Lynch, *The Facts of Reconstruction* (Chicago, 1913), 192.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*; *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 1246.

not be elected to office without Republican votes, and it was his belief that "straight" Republicans would not support him.²⁰

But the other wing of the Republican party welcomed Chalmers with open arms. This smaller group, composed chiefly of white men under the leadership of George C. McKee, postmaster at Jackson,²¹ contained Republicans of ability, character, and some means, such as Jason Niles and his son, Henry, of Kosciusko; Green C. Chandler, United States district attorney for North Mississippi; George R. Buchanan of Holly Springs; and Judges Luke Lea and Harvey R. Ware, of South Mississippi. These men elevated the general Republican standard in the state. For years they had been slighted by the Republicans in Washington, while the black wing received the larger portion of favors.²²

If the two Republican factions could have buried their differences, then indeed would Democratic control of Mississippi have been gravely threatened. The Negro and white Republicans, Greenbackers, and Independent Democrats, if united, would have been strong enough to take Mississippi out of the Democratic fold.

Chalmers attempted to reconcile the two Republican factions, but he encountered almost insuperable obstacles. Inasmuch as the black Republican wing had practically monopolized party control and patronage in the state since the party split during Reconstruction days, the Negroes were as hostile toward the rival white Republicans as toward the Democrats. Furthermore, the new movement led by Chalmers and supported by the white Republicans proposed to drop even the name of Republican, and to present new men and new issues.²³ This meant, of course,

²⁰ Brookhaven *Ledger*, May 18, 1882.

²¹ See sketch of McKee in *Biographical Directory of the American Congress, 1774-1927*, p. 1266.

²² Other white Republicans of prominence were James W. Lee, H. C. Powers, J. B. Deason, W. A. Alcorn, and Willard Dubard. As members of the state Republican executive committee, they signed a protest to President Arthur against the "perpetual dabbling in Mississippi matters" by Washingtonians who claimed to be Mississippians, but whose only connection was that of using Mississippi "as a place to hold office from." George C. McKee to Chandler, July 8, 1882, with enclosure, Chandler Manuscripts.

²³ Harvey R. Ware to Chandler, May 15, 1882, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 87; Chalmers to President Arthur, December, 1882, in Memphis *Weekly Appeal*, April 11, 1883.

the submerging of the Republican party as such in the state, which the Negro leaders naturally fought with every resource available.

On the other hand, the white Republicans suspected that the black leaders had an understanding with the Democratic senators, Lamar and James Z. George, the arrangement being, said George C. McKee, that "Bruce and Lamar . . . keep up negro rule in the Rep. party in order that fear of negro rule in the State may keep white men in the Dem. party."²⁴ For Chalmers to overcome these jealous suspicions and bring about unity was a herculean task, but that was the only course by which he could hope to control the large black Republican vote of the state, which vote he had to have in order to obtain the power and prestige necessary for a successful party machine such as Mahone's.

The first opportunity came for Chalmers to improve his political position when he ran for Congress in the autumn of 1882. He was under the necessity of winning this race, for the Republicans in Washington awaited full proof that he was worthy of their support. This was the first step. If he succeeded in carrying his district, it would naturally follow that his influence in the state would increase. Furthermore, his chances of success in dealing with the black Republicans would be immeasurably improved by his control of the district.

The autumn congressional elections of 1882, however, meant more than an opportunity and a test for Chalmers. Seven congressmen were to be elected from the state and the anti-Democrats²⁵ hoped to elect at least four of them: John R. Lynch, James Hill, Elza Jeffords, and James R. Chalmers. Of this number the contests involving Chalmers and Hill were of the greatest importance at this time since the political fortunes of both the Republican party and the Independent movement in Mississippi would be affected by the success or defeat of the leader of the Independents and of their arch enemy, the black Republican, James Hill. These two contests were also the hardest fought in the state.

²⁴ McKee to Chandler, July 6, 1882, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 93. For similar charges in Georgia, see Ward, "Republican Party in Bourbon Georgia," in *loc. cit.*, 199.

²⁵ "Anti-Democrats" is used in this paper as a blanket label to cover all the groups opposing the Democrats. The term was not in general use in the period under discussion.

In his public announcement of withdrawal from the Democratic party, Chalmers had stated his platform for the campaign. On the questions of the Texas Pacific Railroad and the rebuilding of the levees on the Mississippi River, he carried over parts of the Democratic state platform of the preceding autumn.²⁶ His former low tariff views underwent a change in the direction of protection to help southern manufacturers, and, at the same time, he argued that a high tariff would pay off the national debt and destroy the national banks. Chalmers had one plank entirely of his own manufacture wherein he demanded that the legislature's division of the congressional districts be altered. And a plank that was carried over from the Greenback-Independent platform of 1881 was his declaration in favor of an elective judiciary.²⁷ This was, of course, a bid for Greenback-Independent votes. It might appear also to be an appeal to the small farmer vote, but such it was not, except in the sense that voters usually like to have a voice in the choice of office-holders.²⁸

At first glance it would seem reasonable for Chalmers to plan his platform and strategy so as to obtain the votes of the small farmers, who were numerous in the Second District. One-fifth of the 60,000 small farms in Mississippi were located in this section. And the owners were bona fide small farmers, since two-thirds of the farms measured under one hundred acres in size. Furthermore, many of the farms were worked by their owners, in four counties there being four times as many land-owners working their own land as there were renters.²⁹ But the planks of a farmers' candidate, planks against corporations and monopolies and the agricultural lien law, were missing from Chalmers' platform.³⁰

²⁶ Jackson *Clarion*, August 4, 1881; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, May 17, 1882.

²⁷ Memphis *Daily Appeal*, August 25, 1881; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, May 17, 1882.

²⁸ Mississippi judges had been elective before Reconstruction but the Republicans changed the system, and so many staunch Democrats still favored an elective judiciary that a resolution was placed before the legislature in 1880. By 1890 the question of the judiciary was characterized by some degree of class division; but in 1882 it had little, if any, social significance. Jackson *Clarion*, March 22, 1881; *Journal of the House of Representatives of the State of Mississippi* (Jackson, 1880), 375.

²⁹ *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880*, 22 vols. (Washington, 1883-1885), III, *Agriculture*, 66-67.

³⁰ Columbus (Miss.) *Patron of Husbandry*, August 9, 1879; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, May 17, 1882.

Chalmers believed he had a fair chance of winning for he was personally a popular man, particularly in Panola County. He knew, moreover, that for several years this district had shown a fondness for anti-Democratic candidates. In the 1878 congressional election, two counties, Panola and Marshall, had returned majorities other than Democratic, while Lafayette, Tate, and Yalobusha were barely on the Democratic side.³¹ The district, divided in the 1880 election between Republican, Greenbacker, and Democratic candidates, had given the Democrat, Vannoy H. Manning, nine out of ten counties, but with the narrow margin of only 1,654 in a total vote of 28,816.³² The election returns from the Second District revealed to an observant eye that here was an opportunity for a popular, aggressive politician who could unite the Greenbackers, Independents, and Republicans.

One of Chalmers' first steps was to win the support of the Republicans in his district. Indeed, this support was the *sine qua non* for funds from national Republican coffers.³³ He met with success in that direction, for the Republican district convention, which was composed of delegates selected largely by Chalmers and Republican George R. Buchanan, of Holly Springs, nominated Chalmers for Congress. The black Republicans, however, refused to accept Chalmers' "unauthorized" convention and nomination, notwithstanding instructions from Washington *via* Bruce that they "Give Chalmers a chance at the Bourbons." Instead, they nominated a Negro, Ham C. Carter.³⁴ Thus Chalmers, at the very outset felt the determined opposition of the black Republican wing.

From Washington Chalmers obtained substantial aid in both patronage and money. The appointment of A. T. Wimberly, chairman of the Mississippi Greenback executive committee, to the office of special agent of the internal revenue department, was the first indication to

³¹ Old Election Returns, in the office of the Secretary of State of Mississippi. This volume, which contains the election returns for 1878, 1880, and possibly other years, was available in 1939; but when other election returns were sought in 1940, the volume could not be found. Consequently, newspaper figures, based on reports of the Secretary of State, had to be used for the elections of 1882 and 1884.

³² Old Election Returns.

³³ *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6263 (June 26, 1884).

³⁴ H. C. Carter to Vannoy Manning, in *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, December 27, 1882; *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6259 (June 26, 1884).

the general public of a change in the distribution of federal patronage.³⁵ One week later another appointment, that of Chalmers' father-in-law as superintendent of the government building in Jackson, gave further and convincing evidence of the increasing favor in which Chalmers was held in Washington.³⁶ Two new internal revenue collectors in the Second District, and a change in postmasters at Holly Springs, were also generally attributed to Chalmers' influence.³⁷ A dispatch commenting that although Lynch got the seat in Congress, Chalmers apparently got the patronage indicated the timeliness and significance of these appointments.³⁸

How much campaign money Chalmers obtained from Washington is not certain. The Democrats guessed that possibly \$15,000 was spent by the Republican organization in the Second District.³⁹ Chalmers would have been glad, in all likelihood, to receive such generous aid. After \$2,000 had come to him from the Republican coffers, Chalmers, claiming that he had used "every dollar" of his own, and had tried unsuccessfully to borrow from local friends, asked the godfather of southern Republicans, William E. Chandler, for still more cash so that he could meet his promises. Said Chalmers, indicating his campaign strategy: "Negroes are like chinamen very suspicious & if you promise to pay them money at a certain time it must come there or your influence for the future with them is gone."⁴⁰ On this plea he obtained at least \$500 more, possibly \$1,000.⁴¹

Republican patronage and money might have gone for naught had not Chalmers himself possessed considerable ability and experience as a speaker in political canvasses. His most formidable opponent was Van-

³⁵ Raymond (Miss.) *Hinds County Gazette*, July 19, 1882. Wimberly had announced in June that Mississippi Greenbackers were "solid for Chalmers." *Jackson Comet*, June 10, 1882.

³⁶ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, July 26, 1882.

³⁷ *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6259-61 (June 26, 1884).

³⁸ Quoted in Brookhaven *Ledger*, August 3, 1882.

³⁹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 15, 1882.

⁴⁰ Chalmers to Chandler, October 24, 1882, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 94. See also exchange of telegrams between Chalmers, Buchanan, and Republican congressional committee. *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6263 (June 26, 1884).

⁴¹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 29, 1882.

noy H. Manning, the Democratic incumbent, who had recently been renominated in this, Senator Lamar's home district. Chalmers and Manning arranged an extended schedule of joint debates in various towns in the district and a heated campaign was in prospect. Because of the tempers of both candidates, however, their first engagement at Holly Springs came near being their last. An exchange of notes followed the debate, and a duel was narrowly averted.⁴² The joint canvass continued until Chalmers withdrew on the plea of ill health. Manning spoke as scheduled, and Chalmers later filled his engagements alone.⁴³

Meanwhile, the Negro Republican leader, James Hill, was maneuvering to obtain the Republican nomination for Congress in the Seventh District. For weeks prior to the district convention, white Republicans in Mississippi protested to William E. Chandler and to the Republican Congressional Committee in Washington against Hill's candidacy on the ground that "Hills purpose is to give the District to the Bourbons, as he has done . . . since 1874."⁴⁴ But the Negro Republicans came to the Seventh District convention in Hazlehurst demanding James Hill and no one else.⁴⁵ They "contemptuously rejected" the overtures of Greenbackers and Independents for a combination ticket and nominated their candidate for Congress.⁴⁶

Hill's machine, freshly conditioned with patronage and cash from Washington headquarters by way of Blanche K. Bruce,⁴⁷ opposed the Democratic candidate, Ethelbert Barksdale, who had re-established

⁴² The whole correspondence between the two was preserved by Edgar S. Wilson, a young newspaper man who was in Holly Springs at the time of the debate. Wilson published the letters in the *Memphis Commercial Appeal*, about fifty years later. The clipping containing the correspondence has no date of publication except December 6. The Greenwood (Miss.) *Yazoo Valley Flag*, September 14, 1882, and the Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, September 6, November 1, 1882, mentioned the exchange but did not print it.

⁴³ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 1, 1882.

⁴⁴ Ware to Chandler, May 28, 1882, in Halsell, "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 89; *id.* to *id.*, [November] 1882, *ibid.*, 95; Henry C. Niles to Chandler, June 7, 1882, *ibid.*, 89-90.

⁴⁵ Their devotion to Hill may have been increased by a Negro preacher who urged that they vote for Hill, for "there is more involved in this election than you are aware of." Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, August 23, 1882.

⁴⁶ Wesson (Miss.) *Herald*, quoted in Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, August 23, 1882; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, October 18, 1882.

⁴⁷ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, September 27, October 11, 1882.

himself in the good graces of the Democrats.⁴⁸ As the race grew warmer, the Greenbackers rallied to Barksdale,⁴⁹ and one editor predicted that the McKee Republicans also would vote for Barksdale in preference to Hill.⁵⁰ When the November election returns showed that Barksdale had won over Hill by an unusually large majority for that district, a majority of over 5,000,⁵¹ the white Republicans indignantly reported to William E. Chandler: "Jim Hill had all the money he wanted in his race for Congress he had the prestige of Federal patronage, and he had a largely Republican District—and he lost it—Now is he to dominate the State longer[?]"⁵²

The fate suffered by James Hill at the polls was similar to that of all but two of the other anti-Democratic candidates for Congress. One exception was Elza Jeffords, Republican, who was elected from the Third (or river) District by a large majority.⁵³ A Republican victory in that section was not unexpected because of the large Negro population. Henry L. Muldrow, of the First District; Hernando D. Money, of the Fourth; Otho R. Singleton, of the Fifth; Henry S. Van Eaton of the Sixth; and Barksdale of the Seventh District, all Democrats, were elected.⁵⁴

The only close contest was between Chalmers and Manning in the Second District. Chalmers carried his home county, Panola, by a three to one vote. Marshall County gave him a handsome majority, Benton went to him by about one hundred votes, while De Soto and Tallahatchie remained Democratic by narrow margins, and Tippah and Union, as usual, returned large Democratic majorities. A serious blow to the Democrats was the loss of Lafayette, Senator Lamar's home county,

⁴⁸ Interview of Senator Lamar by S. V. D. Hill, in *Macon Beacon*, October 14, 1882; reprinted in *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 1, 1882.

⁴⁹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, August 30, 1882.

⁵⁰ Aberdeen (Miss.) *Examiner*, quoted in *Jackson Comet*, August 26, 1882.

⁵¹ The vote of the Seventh District, as given in the *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882, was 10,914 for Barksdale, 5,448 for Hill.

⁵² Henry C. Niles to Chandler, November 25, 1882, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 96. See also *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, November 22, 1882.

⁵³ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.* Henry Niles, who was Singleton's white Republican opponent, received only 57 votes to Singleton's 6,121.

which rolled up a vote of 1,478 for Chalmers to Manning's 1,115. The loss of Lafayette must have been gall and wormwood to the Lamar Democrats, while Chalmers was doubtlessly pleased beyond measure.⁵⁵

It immediately became apparent that Chalmers' election depended on the vote of one county, Tate. There a clerical error had awarded 1,472 votes to "J. R. Chambless" and none to Chalmers, with the result that the vote of the entire district was declared to be:

Manning	8,749
Chalmers	8,257
Carter	129
J. R. Chambless	1,472

The secretary of state thereupon declared that Manning was entitled to the election certificate.⁵⁶ But since there was no candidate named J. R. Chambless, the votes had evidently been cast for J. R. Chalmers. The contest was so close that the 1,472 Chambless votes would win the election for Chalmers if he could have them officially recognized as his. And so he took steps to that end.

Meanwhile, Chalmers and the anti-Democrats congratulated themselves on the outcome of the congressional elections of 1882. True, two districts, the First and Fifth, remained almost solidly Democratic, but the Second and the Third went Independent and Republican, respectively, and certain counties in other districts showed anti-Democratic majorities. Chalmers carried five of the nine counties in his district, and in two of the remaining four his vote was more than three-fourths as large as the Democratic vote.⁵⁷ Elza Jeffords carried five of the ten counties in the Third District, and received half as many votes as his Democratic opponent in another county.⁵⁸ In the Sixth District Lynch carried two counties and showed a strength greater than fifty per cent

⁵⁵ *Ibid.* The bitterness of the Democrats towards Chalmers and the other Democratic deserters may be seen in a letter written three years later by L. Q. C. Lamar, Secretary of the Interior, concerning the appointment to office of such a deserter. Lamar to General [Edward C. Walthall], March 28, 1885, in Lamar Private Letter Books (Mississippi Department of Archives and History), I.

⁵⁶ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882.

⁵⁷ These figures include Tate County in the Chalmers column.

⁵⁸ There were ten counties in the district, but only eight reported. Old Election Returns.

of his opponent's vote in seven more counties. The fusion candidate in the Fourth carried one county and received a vote equal to fifty per cent or more of the Democratic vote in three other counties. James Hill received half as many votes as did Barksdale in four counties of the Seventh. Throughout the state the various anti-Democratic candidates had won thirteen counties and a vote equal to fifty per cent or more of the Democratic vote in seventeen other counties out of the seventy-four in the state. Democratic candidates received a total of 47,960 votes, while 31,256 were cast for their opponents.⁵⁹ The returns showed the strongest opposition to the Democrats since Reconstruction days.

Chalmers' approximately 10,000 votes came from a number of groups. The white Republicans, the Greenbackers, and the Independents probably gave him their full support. From the Democrats he won some soldier votes, and probably some farmer votes, since Manning was not popular with the farmers.⁶⁰ But there is a reason to believe that it was the Negro vote that gave him his apparent majority. The two counties that gave him over 4,000 votes—nearly half the number cast for him—contained 16,500 more Negroes than white people, while in the district as a whole there were about 3,500 more Negroes than whites.⁶¹ It cannot be doubted that Chalmers' political activities among the Negroes were mercenary. In an appeal to William E. Chandler for more money, made only a few days before the election, he stated plainly that he needed funds to fulfill his promises to Negroes,⁶² and at least one newspaper editor openly attributed his success to his chicanery and trickery with ignorant Negro voters.⁶³

The Democrats, while charging Chalmers with the use of illegal methods to influence voters, also blamed themselves for their defeat. Because of overconfidence, they had not worked hard, nor had they gotten out the Democratic vote. Manning himself pointed out that with

⁵⁹ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882.

⁶⁰ Columbus *Patron of Husbandry*, July 15, 1882.

⁶¹ *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880, I, Population*, 397-98; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882.

⁶² Chalmers to Chandler, October 24, 1882, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 94-95.

⁶³ Macon *Beacon*, January 27, 1883. See also Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 29, 1882.

approximately 37,000 voters in the district, only about 17,000 votes were cast.⁶⁴ In Lafayette County, for example, the total vote in 1882 was about 1,000 less than in 1880, all of which number the Democrats seem to have lost in this election, while the Republicans increased their votes by 268.⁶⁵

Acting without delay to obtain the disputed Chambless votes, Chalmers, through the order of a judge of the state supreme court and later a mandamus of the district attorney, tried to win the certificate of election, but the secretary of state disregarded both orders. Chalmers' suit came before the state supreme court in June, 1883, when it was dismissed on the ground that the certificate of election had been issued to Manning by the governor upon the statement of the secretary of state and was irrevocable.⁶⁶

While Chalmers' case was still in the state courts, he was not neglecting other means to win national Republican sympathy. When he served notice on Manning, on December 4, 1882, that he would contest the election, he declared that a conspiracy existed between Manning and the officers at the polls.⁶⁷ Immediately charge and countercharge flew thick and fast. Ham C. Carter notified Manning that he, too, would contest the seat, but his charges were directed at Chalmers. Carter's allegations included: "conspirative agreements," misuse of federal patronage, intimidation of pro-Carter postmasters in the district, the threatening of Carter by Chalmers' managers to prevent him from keeping his speaking engagements, and interference with election officers and ballot boxes by special deputy marshals who had been appointed at

⁶⁴ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 29, 1882.

⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, November 22, 1882.

⁶⁶ Henry C. Myers, Secretary of State *v.* James R. Chalmers, 60 *Mississippi Reports*, 772; Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, June 13, 1882. The Democratic press expressed itself fully and freely on the question of Chalmers' election. Practically all declared for "justice," agreeing in spirit with the Jackson *New Mississippian*, which asked: "Can the Democratic party afford to wrong even J. R. Chalmers?" Quoted in Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 29, 1882. The view taken by the few editors who opposed counting the votes for Chalmers was that the 1,472 votes had not been cast for him by name and he was therefore not entitled to them. Vicksburg *Herald* and Vicksburg *Commercial*, quoted in Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882. See also Jackson *State Ledger*, April 21, 1883.

⁶⁷ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, January 10, 1883.

the instigation of Chalmers.⁶⁸ Manning's response contended that Chalmers had obtained at least one-third of his votes illegally. He reiterated several of Carter's charges, adding that Chalmers had illegally influenced ignorant Negro voters.⁶⁹

Meanwhile Chalmers was surpassing the proverbial bee in his busy-ness. Pressed by debt and spurred by anger, he had suggested to William E. Chandler immediately after election day that since he, Chalmers, could not occupy his seat in Congress until March, he would like to be made assistant to the district attorney in the interim, and promised that he would convict the ballot box stuffers.⁷⁰ A month later, he received the coveted appointment for the districts of North and South Mississippi.⁷¹ Turning his efforts toward fulfilling his promise, he infuriated the Democrats of the northern district, which section alone he favored with his activities to uncover election conspiracies and violations. The Democrats pointed out bitterly that the correspondence of Manning and his friends was "hailed" before the grand jury and used out of its correct order, while Chalmers' and his friends' correspondence was untouched.⁷² They charged also that indictments were returned because the grand jury was composed largely of ignorant Negroes. All the cases prepared by Chalmers ended in vindications, hung juries, or quashed indictments.⁷³ The only advantage gained by anyone, said the Democrats, was Chalmers' fee of \$1,000 (which was in fact only \$500).⁷⁴

During the contest over Chalmers' seat in Congress, Republicans in Washington evidently thought he would win, for they continued to support him with patronage, as was shown by several changes in postmasters

⁶⁸ *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, December 27, 1882.

⁶⁹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, January 10, 1883. See also *ibid.*, November 29, 1882.

⁷⁰ Chalmers to Chandler, November 6, 1882, in Chandler Manuscripts.

⁷¹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, May 30, 1883; *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6256 (June 26, 1884).

⁷² In Tallahatchie County, where the voters for both candidates had united in resisting assembly because of a smallpox epidemic, Manning's friends were indicted while Chalmers' were only summoned as witnesses. *Holly Springs South*, quoted in *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, June 6, 1883.

⁷³ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, January 24, June 6, 1883; *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, January 31, 1883.

⁷⁴ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, May 30, 1883; *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6254, 6256 (June 26, 1884).

in his district.⁷⁵ The appointment of a Chalmers man, John T. Hull, as receiver of public monies, particularly impressed Mississippians, for it was well known that this was an office coveted by the black Republicans.⁷⁶ A Democratic editor, after mulling over Hull's appointment, arrived at an accurate analysis several months late when he concluded: "It seems to be the beginning of a new departure by the Republican managers, with Mahone in Virginia for its counterpart."⁷⁷

This editor's slowness in realizing the true situation was common in Mississippi, for Chalmers' negotiations and deals were secret and for a long time the Democrats could only guess from clues what was happening between him and the Republicans in Washington. But confirmation of the surmise came from Washington. The report reaching Mississippi was to the effect that the United States commissioner of internal revenue had informed Lynch that he must not complain if patronage was given Chalmers, just as Mahone had it in Virginia. He was said to have explained that the Republicans had experimented and found that Lynch and his followers could not deliver Mississippi to the Republicans, and that now Chalmers should have an opportunity to bring about the desired result.⁷⁸

As a result of Chalmers' protest, Manning was not permitted to take his seat at the opening of the Forty-eighth Congress in December, 1883, and the case was referred to the House committee on elections. The contest in the House turned, not upon the disputed vote in Tate County, nor upon the action of the secretary of state of Mississippi, nor upon the election charges of "corrupt bargain" and improper use of officers or

⁷⁵ Chalmers to President Arthur, December [n.d.], 1882, in *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, April 11, 1883; Chalmers to David B. Henderson, September 12, 1882, *ibid.* Chalmers caused a local furor when he tried to have the postmistress at Oxford removed because she was under "personal obligation" to Senator Lamar. He also sought the removal of the chief clerk because he was a "partisan Democrat," and the colored carrier because he supported the black Republican candidate for Congress.

⁷⁶ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, March 17, 1883. The editor thought this appointment looked "ominous" for "straight" Republicans.

⁷⁷ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, March 14, 1883.

⁷⁸ Raymond *Hinds County Gazette*, May 26, 1883, printed this report which came through Abram Fulkerson, a former Readjuster congressman from Virginia, who claimed to have overheard the conversation in the office of the federal officer mentioned. It was repeated in *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6262 (June 26, 1884).

patronage, but upon the point that Chalmers, by accepting the federal office of special assistant to the district attorney, had disqualified himself as congressman, since, according to law, no federal office holder may be a member of the House during his continuance in office. Chalmers' friends apparently proved to the satisfaction of the majority of the House that he had relinquished the office in sufficient time to avoid the disqualification, but it was not until June 20, 1884, that the committee finally presented a resolution declaring that he had been duly elected.⁷⁹ This resolution was adopted by the House on June 25 and Chalmers took his seat on the same day, but the prolonged delay, caused in part by sickness of committee members and by rules of procedure, had damaged his prospects in Mississippi, because he lost in a measure the prestige that would have accompanied a speedy vindication.

While Chalmers' star was rising in Washington, the Negroes, Lynch and Hill, were scheming to dim that star in Mississippi. Lynch presided at a definitely anti-Chalmers meeting when the Republican state executive committee gathered in Jackson in June, 1883. He threw down the gauntlet in his opening speech when he declared that he could not support certain prominent men who were active against the Democrats because he believed that they were working for "selfish ambition" and "had not the interest of the Republican party at heart." He would approve and encourage a third party, he said, provided it be drawn from the Democratic, not the Republican, ranks.⁸⁰ A resolution complimentary to Chalmers was introduced by his friends and was referred to a subcommittee, where it was allowed to die.⁸¹ When Chalmers, who had been invited to address the convention, arrived, Lynch refused to introduce him.⁸² A Democratic editor subsequently gave it as his opinion that Chalmers had been "Lynch-ed" at the Republican convention.⁸³ Chalmers, despairing of conciliation, reported a few days later to Wil-

⁷⁹ *Congressional Record*, 48 Cong., 1 Sess., 6252-65 (June 26, 1884).

⁸⁰ *Jackson State Ledger*, June 16, 1883.

⁸¹ *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, June 13, 1883.

⁸² *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, June 16, 1883.

⁸³ *Jackson New Mississippian*, quoted in *Raymond Hinds County Gazette*, June 23, 1883.

liam E. Chandler that his efforts to unite the two Republican wings "have brought the Hill faction down on me" ⁸⁴

But when the Republican state convention met in April of the next year to elect delegates to the national convention of 1884, the white wing was given more voice in party matters. Chalmers' friend, George Buchanan, was elected temporary chairman; at least one Chalmers man, John S. Burton, of the Second District, was elected a delegate; and Reuben Davis, Greenbacker, was invited to address the convention. On the other hand, the convention elected Lynch permanent chairman; Bruce addressed the body; and Lynch, Hill, and Bruce were all elected delegates to the national convention.⁸⁵ This recognition of the white wing, though slight, was an extraordinary event, and can be accounted for only by the conjecture that some inducement had been offered the Negroes by the Washington Republicans.⁸⁶

The peaceful appearance of the convention, however, was but an interlude before the storm. Bitter patronage rivalry estranged the factions even more completely in the summer of 1884. Republicans in Washington continued to distribute favors to both wings, possibly in the hope of eventually uniting them and possibly because they were afraid to drop either of them, but certainly with the result of aggravating discord and jealousy between them. Hill's success in having certain Independents who held offices in his congressional district replaced with his Republican friends irritated Chalmers. A particularly troublesome bit of patronage was the position of superintendent of the public building at Oxford in Chalmers' own district. Chalmers knew that the Secretary of the Treasury had directed the appointment of a Chalmers man, but considerable time elapsed without the appointment being made. Finally, Chalmers heard that James Hill was boasting that he had prevented the appointment, and that one of Hill's friends would be chosen instead.

⁸⁴ Chalmers to Chandler, July 2, 1883, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 98.

⁸⁵ Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, April 23, 30, 1884.

⁸⁶ The fact that John R. Lynch later presided as temporary chairman of the Republican national convention lends some strength to this conjecture.

In addition to the continuing patronage quarrels, there were fights over nominations to Congress. Chalmers charged that the black Republicans planned to run their own candidates irrespective of white Republicans and Independents. In the Fifth Congressional District, for example, Chalmers' opinion was that white Republicans of character and ability, such as Henry or Jason Niles, would have made excellent candidates. But Hill, through his revenue crowd, had Josh Smith, a little-known deputy, nominated.⁸⁷

In Chalmers' own district Hill exerted every effort to defeat him. According to Chalmers, both James Hill and Hill's brother, who was a revenue deputy, promised offices to delegates at the district convention if they would vote against Chalmers. Hill then tried the stratagem of contested seats, but failed to split the convention. He instructed his brother to bolt at Chalmers' nomination, and that move also failed. Chalmers was unanimously nominated, whereupon, according to Chalmers, Hill began to plot his defeat at the polls in November.⁸⁸

The Democrats gave Chalmers a hard fight in his district, for they did not intend to be caught napping a second time. His Democratic opponent, James B. Morgan,⁸⁹ held sixty joint discussions with Chalmers in various towns. The fact that the election was presidential as well as congressional brought out Democratic speakers such as Governor Robert Lowry and Senator Lamar who spoke at several places in the district.⁹⁰

Chalmers had warned William E. Chandler that "we may not elect

⁸⁷ Chalmers to Chandler, July 16, 1884, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 100-101.

⁸⁸ *Ibid.* See also, Jackson *New Mississippian*, October 21, 1884.

⁸⁹ James B. Morgan lived in De Soto County, Mississippi, the greater part of his life. He was probate judge, state senator, district chancellor, and congressman. Goodspeed (ed.), *Biographical and Historical Memoirs of Mississippi*, 2 vols. (Chicago, 1891), II, 460.

⁹⁰ Jackson *State Ledger*, November 7, 1884. Chalmers directed his speeches against Senator Lamar as well as against his opponent, Morgan. The "burden of his song," as reported by a correspondent who heard Chalmers speak at Holly Springs, was a quotation of Cassius' which Chalmers applied to Lamar: "Upon what meat hath this our Caesar fed, that he hath grown so great?" Chalmers answered his question, as he had for years, by proving to his own satisfaction that Lamar had betrayed true Democratic principles and the party by his policy of reconciliation with the North. Memphis *Weekly Appeal*, October 29, 1884.

a single Congressman" as long as James Hill led the Republicans.⁹¹ Whether it was Hill's fault or not, the anti-Democrats lost in every congressional district in the state in 1884. Morgan defeated Chalmers by nearly 4,000 votes, and every county in the district swung back into the Democratic line except Panola, which remained faithful to Chalmers. The Democratic vote in the First District was twice as heavy as in 1882. The Third District, with an estimated Republican majority of 20,000 votes, elected a Democrat by more than 5,000 votes. Fred G. Barry in the Fourth, Singleton in the Fifth, Van Eaton in the Sixth, and Barksdale in the Seventh were elected by large majorities.⁹²

"This election buries Chalmers so deep he will never be resurrected," crowed a Democratic editor.⁹³ Chalmers, however, had been buried before by the Democrats. Far from giving up, he planned to contest the seat with Morgan, and took steps for that purpose. When the full Democratic strength in state and national elections became apparent, however, he did not contest, but withdrew from public life for a time.⁹⁴

Why did Chalmers not succeed as Mahone had done? Mahone's success was due largely to his emphasis on "liberalism in government and the interests of the people against the speculators and Bourbons."⁹⁵ Chalmers' platform and speeches contain no evidence of liberalism, and no awareness of the possibilities of an alignment of the people against the Bourbons or speculators. His political acumen and foresight were inferior to Mahone's, and his only interest was in the immediate political situation.

Chalmers' great opportunity to gain permanent and solid support was the small farmers' votes. Their strength and their dissatisfaction with

⁹¹ Chalmers to Chandler, July 16, 1884, in Halsell (ed.), "Republican Factionalism in Mississippi," in *loc. cit.*, 101.

⁹² Only slight variations in election returns are found in the three tabulations given in the Jackson *Weekly Clarion*, November 12, 1884, and the Jackson *State Ledger*, November 11, 21, 1884.

⁹³ Jackson *State Ledger*, November 7, 1884.

⁹⁴ Chalmers continued his bitter personal opposition to L. Q. C. Lamar. When Cleveland nominated Lamar for the Supreme Court in 1887, Chalmers promptly wrote to Chandler, then senator from New Hampshire, suggesting means to be used to defeat Lamar's confirmation. Chalmers to Chandler, December 22, 26, and 31, 1887, in Chandler Manuscripts.

⁹⁵ Moger, "Origin of the Democratic Machine in Virginia," in *loc. cit.*, 201.

Democratic party leaders were evident as early as 1878, when the legislature instructed Senator Lamar on his vote for silver. The Grange also was active during those years, and through its newspaper inveighed constantly against lawyer-politicians and hard money senators.⁹⁶ If Chalmers had offered an adequate program for agrarian betterment, he could possibly have won part of the farmer vote which later demonstrated its strength prior to and in the Mississippi constitutional convention of 1890. But he did not grasp that opportunity. Consequently, many of the small farmers in his district stuck to the Democratic party in preference to him.⁹⁷

Perhaps Chalmers did not want the farm vote. He may have reasoned that if he could secure and continue to use Republican funds as effectively as he had in 1882 for controlling ignorant Negro votes, he did not need the farmers' support, nor would he fear either white Democratic opposition or black Republican schemes.

Chalmers was inferior to Mahone in organizing ability as well as in political acumen. Mahone, by business-like methods, forced the Bourbons to change party policies, organization, and leadership; but Chalmers was content to use the political methods of Reconstruction days, and his only influence on the Mississippi Democracy was to make it work harder for a few years.

On the other hand, Chalmers had more difficulties to overcome than did Mahone. There was no debt readjustment problem nor any other equally pervasive issue to split the Mississippi Democrats and break the hold of the Reconstruction leaders. Furthermore, Chalmers never had

⁹⁶ *Columbus Patron of Husbandry*, May 3, 24, June 7, 21, July 12, September 20, 1879; July 9, 1881. A discussion of the Grange and its accomplishments may be found in James S. Ferguson, "The Granger Movement in Mississippi" (M. A. thesis, Louisiana State University, 1940), in Mississippi Department of Archives and History.

⁹⁷ Three poor and one wealthy county were regularly Democratic, while three rich counties and one poor one showed anti-Democratic majorities in two congressional elections. The terms "rich" and "poor" are based on census reports of farm and produce values. In the figures for the state, no county in this district was among the poorest thirteen or higher than eighth in wealth. *Tenth Census of the United States, 1880*, III, *Agriculture*, Table V, 66-67; Table VII, 122-23; Old Election Returns; *Jackson Weekly Clarion*, November 22, 1882, November 12, 1884; *Jackson State Ledger*, November 11, 21, 1884.

the support of a strong and popular newspaper, as did Mahone.⁹⁸ He never attained the power and prestige of high offices, such as senator or chairman of a state committee; nor did he have an ally in the governor's chair; nor did he to any great degree control the patronage necessary for building a political machine. He had to fight both Democrats and Republicans for what he gained. The irreconcilable split in the Mississippi Republican party was probably a major obstacle to his success, for it prevented fusion under his leadership from becoming more than a local political matter.

A final obstacle, one that Mahone did not feel as gravely as did Chalmers, was the oppressive weight of public opinion in a state located deep in the solid South. The experiences of ten years of Reconstruction were too fresh in the minds of the people, race prejudice still too bitter, the fetish of party regularity too powerful, for many men to desert the Democratic party for the purpose of joining a man or a party identified or allied with the Republicans, white or black.

The high point of Chalmers' career as an Independent, and of Independentism as a political movement, was reached in 1882 with his election to Congress. It may well be questioned, however, whether the Independents ever accepted him as one of them. He had their name and support for a time, but when his relationship with the Republicans became known, and when the Democrats bestirred themselves to win back their lost members, Independent strength fell away from him. Both Chalmers and Independentism profited politically by their short-lived union, but neither he nor the Independents through that union permanently influenced Mississippi parties or politics.

⁹⁸ Chalmers had bought the *Vicksburg Commercial* while a member of the Democratic party, and had fought Lamar in its columns; but he disposed of the paper before he moved to Sardis. No prominent newspaper in Mississippi supported him after he withdrew from the Democratic party. He realized the importance of having a paper, and asked Chandler for some provision in that direction, but all that he obtained was thousands of copies of an issue of the *National Republican* which contained laudatory articles about Chalmers. Chalmers to Chandler, May 15, 1882, in Chandler Manuscripts. See also, *Memphis Weekly Appeal*, December 27, 1882.

The Southern Brigade: A Sidelight on the British Military Establishment in America, 1763-1775

BY CHARLES L. MOWAT

It has long been realized that the decision taken at the end of the Seven Years' War to maintain in peacetime a permanent military establishment of ten thousand regular troops in North America was one of the most important ever made by the British government affecting the American colonies. Its general effect, of course, was to arouse in the colonists a fear, at least in part justified, of military domination, and to bring to the fore the questions involved in the relations of the civil and military powers. It was, in fact, part of a much larger program, to establish imperial authority over the colonial governments by taking away from the latter control over Indian affairs and western lands, as was done in the royal proclamation of October 7, 1763, and to bring other functions, such as those of the customs service, the vice-admiralty courts, and the land and coast survey, under imperial control, exercised through officials appointed for two districts, the Northern and the Southern. This program at once brought into question the constitutional relations of colonies and mother country, especially as the expenses involved were to be defrayed by American revenues collected by authority of British acts of Parliament.

The reasons for the decision to maintain the military establishment have been clearly demonstrated. Originally the colonies were, in time of peace, responsible for their own defense through the militia system,

and in time of war were encouraged to raise troops, as in Queen Anne's and King George's wars, to serve under British commanders. The decision taken in the 1740's to favor western expansion of the colonies, bringing with it increased danger of clashes with the French and the Indians, raised a doubt of the wisdom of the existing military arrangements, but the attempt to improve them by a colonial union, whether voluntary or imposed, came to nothing. From the time of the appointment of General Edward Braddock as commander in chief in America, and the creation of the two Indian superintendents in 1756, the idea of maintaining a permanent British military command on the continent was hardening into set policy. The Seven Years' War only confirmed its wisdom by the demonstration of the difficulties of the requisition system, by the poor quality of the American recruits, and by the unequal military efforts made by the different colonies. And though the French menace had been removed by the course of the war, the Indian was thereby increased, since the French barrier against expansion into Indian territory had been swept away; the Conspiracy of Pontiac was a timely and grim illustration of this.¹

Yet there has been little attempt to recount the history of the resultant military establishment between 1763 and 1775, and its internal organization, though there is abundant material for the task, much of it in print.² Nor is it proposed to essay the task here, but merely to give some

¹ Clarence W. Alvord, *The Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, 2 vols. (Cleveland, 1917), I, 114-33; George L. Beer, *British Colonial Policy, 1754-1765* (New York, 1907), 16-30, 52-71, 173-76, 261-68; Stanley M. Pargellis, *Lord Loudoun in North America* (New Haven, 1933), *passim*.

² Unpublished material includes the manuscripts in the Colonial Office, War Office, and Treasury series in the Public Record Office, London; the Gage Papers in the William L. Clements Library, University of Michigan; the Haldimand Papers, British Museum (available in copies in the Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, and in the Library of Congress, Washington, D. C.). The main printed source is Professor Clarence E. Carter's admirable edition of General Gage's correspondence with the authorities in London: *The Correspondence of General Thomas Gage . . . 1763-1775*, 2 vols. (New Haven, 1931-1933). The Haldimand Papers are calendared in the "Haldimand Collection, Calendar," published in successive issues of the *Report on Canadian Archives* by Douglas Brymner, Archivist, for the years 1884-1889 (Ottawa, 1885-1890); this calendar has its own continuous pagination through the *Reports* and is here cited as "Haldimand Collection," 113 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1884), etc. The organization of the British army in America after Gage's command is described in Edward E. Curtis, *The Organization of the British Army in the American Revolution* (New Haven, 1926).

account of a part of the establishment, the Southern Brigade, with special reference to the effect upon it of the large-scale reorganization of imperial affairs in America undertaken in 1768.

The organization of the establishment was first worked out by Welbore Ellis, the secretary at war, and Sir Jeffrey Amherst, the commander in chief in America, in 1763.³ There was little to go upon as precedent, since the only standing forces maintained previously by the British in America in time of peace were a regiment in Nova Scotia, three "independent companies" in South Carolina and Georgia, and four "independent companies" in New York.⁴ The disposition of troops proposed by Amherst was based on the need of keeping the new subjects in Canada and Louisiana (the Mobile district) "in due Subjection," and "to retain the Inhabitants of our antient Provinces in a State of Constitutional Dependence upon Great Britain."⁵ On the basis of a total force of ten regiments, it placed the bulk of the troops in the newly ceded territories, the main stations proposed being Nova Scotia (two regiments), Quebec, Montreal, Niagara, Detroit, Pensacola, the lower Mississippi, St. Augustine, and South Carolina (responsible for Georgia also), each with a single regiment, some companies of which were to be stationed in outposts manned from the main garrison.⁶

This was in essence the plan actually followed. A table of the distribution of the troops in February, 1767, typical of the normal arrangements before the development of political troubles in New England led to altered dispositions, shows a total force equivalent to sixteen regiments, three in Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, three, and six companies of a fourth, in the province of Quebec, one at Detroit and other western posts, one at Crown Point and posts in northern New York, one in New York city, one each in New Jersey, Pennsylvania, St. Augustine, Pensacola, Mobile, the Illinois country, and three companies in South Carolina and Georgia.⁷

³ Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, 127-32.

⁴ Beer, *British Colonial Policy*, 10-14.

⁵ Clarence W. Alvord and Clarence E. Carter (eds.), *The Critical Period, 1763-1765* (Illinois State Historical Library, *Collections*, X; Springfield, 1915), 6.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 5-11.

⁷ Alvord and Carter (eds.), *The New Regime, 1765-1767* (*ibid.*, XI; Springfield, 1916),

The commander in chief over this military establishment from November, 1763, when he succeeded Amherst, until 1775, except for one short interval, was Major General Thomas Gage, who, from his headquarters in New York, not only exercised general supervision over the military affairs of the continent, but also was inevitably concerned with the political conditions in each of the colonies. This involved an incessant exchange of letters between Gage and the local commanding officers in the various stations, with whom he corresponded directly.⁸ From the start, however, some decentralization seems to have been intended, for, beginning with the "List of General & Staff Officers in the Establishment of North America, from the 25th December 1764 to 24th June 1765," provision was made for two brigadiers general.⁹

The first brigadiers general were Colonel Ralph Burton and Colonel Henry Bouquet.¹⁰ The former had been military governor at Montreal, and was given the command over the Northern district, which comprised chiefly the province of Quebec. He thus became superior, in military matters, to the governor, Colonel the Honorable James Murray, who, before the institution of civil government in 1764, had been Burton's superior as military governor in the Quebec district. This circumstance aggravated the normal friction between the military and civil powers in Montreal, where Burton made his headquarters, and led to many difficulties until both he and Murray were recalled to England. Murray's successor as governor, Colonel Guy Carleton, was given the command of the Northern district as brigadier general concurrently with his civil

⁸ Clarence E. Carter, "The Office of Commander in Chief: A Phase of Imperial Unity on the Eve of the Revolution," in Richard B. Morris (ed.), *The Era of the American Revolution: Studies Inscribed to Evaris Boutell Greene* (New York, 1939), 170-213; Carter, "The Significance of the Military Office in America, 1763-1775," in *American Historical Review* (New York, 1895-), XXVIII (1923), 175-88.

⁹ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 300. The earlier lists of general and staff officers in America for December, 1763, to June, 1764, and June-December, 1764, which are in the Gage Papers, do not include any brigadiers general.

¹⁰ In the British army "brigadier general" was (and is) a temporary rank given to the officer commanding a brigade, a unit consisting of two or more regiments brigaded together. The rank thus stands between those of colonel and major general. Sometimes the simple term "brigadier" is used. *New English Dictionary*, 10 vols. in 20 (Oxford, 1888-1928), I, ii, 1101-1102, *s.v.*, brigade, brigadier.

position, a combination of offices which prevented a repetition of the troubles of 1764-1766 in Quebec.¹¹

This combination of military and civil offices was never resorted to in the Southern district. The Southern district, like the Northern, was more limited in extent than the name would suggest, and effectively comprised only the province of West Florida (which included the lower Mississippi country), though it was intended to include East Florida also. The troops stationed in it were referred to as the Southern Brigade, and at least once as the Florida Brigade. The normal complement comprised two regiments in West Florida (at Pensacola, Mobile, and outposts), and one in East Florida.

The reason for the creation of these two military districts, both essentially limited to a single outlying province, is not clear, but in the case of the Southern it may have been connected both with the presence of Spanish authority and French population in New Orleans and trans-Mississippi Louisiana, and with the fury of the strife between the military and the civil power in West Florida under the first governor, George Johnstone. Johnstone first quarreled with Robert Farmar, the commanding officer at Mobile, whom he charged with embezzlement and misconduct in several instances; as a result Farmar was subsequently court-martialed and exonerated. Following this, there was a prolonged dispute over the question whether the governor had the command over the fort and garrison at Pensacola and was therefore entitled to give the parole and receive the military returns. When the local commanding officer rejected his claims, Johnstone ordered Lieutenant Colonel David Wedderburn, then commandant at Mobile and superior in rank, to come to Pensacola to assume the command. Wedderburn complied, for which he was roundly rebuked by Gage.¹² It was in these circumstances that

¹¹ Alfred L. Burt, *The Old Province of Quebec* (Minneapolis, 1933), 13-14, 102-18, 125, 128; S. Morley Scott, "Civil and Military Authority in Canada, 1764-1766," in *Canadian Historical Review* (Toronto, 1920-), IX (1928), 117-36.

¹² Clinton N. Howard, "Governor Johnstone in West Florida," in *Florida Historical Quarterly* (Jacksonville, 1908-), XVII (1939), 283-91; Cecil Johnson, *British West Florida, 1763-1783* (New Haven, 1943), 49-53, 98; Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 51; Clarence E. Carter, "The Beginnings of British West Florida," in *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (Cedar Rapids, 1914-), IV (1917), 330-32. Many of the documents relating to the disputes between the civil and military powers in West Florida are printed

Gage welcomed the appointment of Bouquet as brigadier general: "he will in Consequence thereof, take upon him, the command of the Forces in the Southern District. . . and will soon set out for Florida, where I hope he will be able to restore the King's Affairs to proper Order."¹³

In this Gage was disappointed. Colonel Bouquet, a Swiss officer in the 60th Regiment (the Royal Americans), distinguished for his part in the battle of Bushy Run and the relief of Fort Pitt during the Conspiracy of Pontiac,¹⁴ died at Pensacola in September, 1765, within a few days of his arrival. In his place Gage appointed Colonel John Reed, the senior field officer in the district, but as Reed had by then left to join his regiment in the Illinois country the position of acting brigadier fell to Colonel William Tayler, then the commanding officer at St. Augustine.¹⁵ Tayler at once transferred his headquarters to Pensacola, and remained there until superseded in March, 1767, by Colonel Frederick Haldimand, who had received his appointment as brigadier general in command of the Southern district in January, 1766.¹⁶

Haldimand remained in command of the Southern district until March, 1773, when he left for New York to assume temporarily the position of commander in chief during Gage's absence on leave in England.¹⁷ Like his friend Bouquet, Haldimand was a Swiss officer; he had been military governor at Three Rivers, in the province of Quebec, and was subsequently governor of the province, and commander in chief of the forces there, from 1778 to 1784.¹⁸

Haldimand's work in the Southern district, like Tayler's, was mainly concerned with West Florida. Governor Johnstone's quarrel with the military had continued after Bouquet's death. With Lieutenant Colonel Ralph Walsh he had continued his dispute over the command at Pen-

in Dunbar Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766, English Dominion* (Nashville, 1911), I (only this one volume of this intended series was issued).

¹³ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 56.

¹⁴ *Dictionary of National Biography*, 63 vols. (London, 1885-1900), VI, 9.

¹⁵ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 74, 76.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, I, 138, II, 33, 344; Haldimand to Gage, March 25, 1767, Pensacola, Gage Papers.

¹⁷ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 334, 344, 353.

¹⁸ *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXIV, 16; Jean N. McIlwraith, *Sir Frederick Haldimand* (London, 1926), *passim*.

sacola, and over minor matters such as the use of a barrack hut within the fort. Eventually, Johnstone arrested Walsh for high treason, and, for refusing to acknowledge his authority, declared him to be cashiered under the terms of the Mutiny Act. This gave rise to the court martial, which, due to pressure exerted by Johnstone, was terminated incomplete, of an inferior officer who refused to obey Walsh's orders after the supposed cashiering. Johnstone also brought charges against the military storekeeper for refusing to obey his commands in preference to those of the commanding officer.¹⁹ Disputes of this sort Haldimand's presence was intended to end, since his rank as brigadier gave him unchallengeable superiority over the governor in all military matters. Johnstone's departure in January, 1767,²⁰ had, however, already removed the most serious obstacle to harmony in West Florida, and Haldimand, though he had a dispute with Governor Peter Chester in 1771 over the giving out of the parole,²¹ was in the main not troubled by bad relations with the civil authorities.

Haldimand was thus concerned principally with the routine military affairs relating to West Florida: troop movements, promotions, exchanges, leaves, accounts, provisions, the health of the troops, repairs and additions to forts and barracks, water supply. The proximity of the Spaniards in New Orleans led to correspondence with the governor, Don Antonio de Ulloa, concerning a cartel for the return of British deserters in New Orleans, and other matters. The necessity of securing communications with the Illinois posts by way of the Mississippi without passing through Spanish territory led to discussion of a proposal to canalize the River Iberville by which the Mississippi might be reached from Lake Pontchartrain, as well as to consideration of the British posts maintained at Natchez and Fort Bute (or Manchak, the point of junction of the Iberville and Mississippi), and of the proposal to establish a post at Tangipahoa on the eastern side of Lake Pontchartrain. The

¹⁹ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 88, II, 341-43, 364-65, 369-71, 395-98, 435-36; Howard, "Governor Johnstone in West Florida," in *loc. cit.*, 292-303; Johnson, *British West Florida*, 53-56; Carter, "Beginnings of British West Florida," in *loc. cit.*, 334-35; Rowland (ed.), *Mississippi Provincial Archives, 1763-1766, English Dominion*, I, *passim*.

²⁰ Johnson, *British West Florida*, 60.

²¹ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 321, II, 139.

presence in the country of the Creeks, Chickasaws, and Choctaws led to correspondence with John Stuart, the superintendent of Indian affairs in the Southern district, and other Indian officials. Haldimand was also in rather infrequent correspondence with Colonel Tayler and later commanding officers in St. Augustine, and with James Grant, governor of East Florida, concerning the affairs of that province, the communications between Pensacola and St. Augustine, and the value of the East Florida outpost of St. Mark's, Apalache, which lay on the route between the two capitals.²² The officers in East Florida looked, however, primarily to Gage in New York for instructions and advice, and had relatively little to do with the brigadier of the Southern district at Pensacola.²³

The routine work at headquarters at Pensacola was, however, rudely interrupted in 1768 by the reorganization in military and imperial affairs generally which was embarked upon in North America in that year. The entire imperial policy inaugurated in 1763 regarding western lands, Indian relations, and the military establishment, was reconsidered and greatly curtailed in response to the demands in the cabinet in London for retrenchment and economy—a change of policy which reflected the ascendancy of Charles Townshend and the decline in the influence of the Earl of Shelburne.²⁴ The resultant changes in the Southern district included the removal of headquarters from Pensacola to St. Augustine, and the concentration of the main military strength in the South at the latter place, at the expense of West Florida's military importance.

In so far as the change of policy in 1768 resulted in the decrease of

²² "Haldimand Collection," 23-57, 109-20, 127-31 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1884), 147-65 (*ibid.*, 1885), 490-508 (*ibid.*, 1886); McIlwraith, *Sir Frederick Haldimand*, 65-82; cf. Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 135, 150, 159, 160, 168, 187. Haldimand's correspondence with Gage is to be found in the Gage Papers as well as in the Haldimand Papers. The correspondence of Tayler, while acting as brigadier, with Gage is also in the Gage Papers, and confirms the impression of the brigadier's work given by Haldimand's letters. For Apalache see Mark F. Boyd (ed.), "From a Remote Frontier: Letters and Documents Pertaining to San Marcos de Apalache, 1763-1769 . . .," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XIX (1941), 179-212, and succeeding issues.

²³ Charles L. Mowat, "Material Relating to British East Florida in the Gage Papers and Other Manuscript Collections in the William L. Clements Library," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XVIII (1939), 46-60.

²⁴ Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, I, 240-51, 276-86, 325 *et seq.*, II, 11 *et seq.*; R. A. Humphreys, "Lord Shelburne and British Colonial Policy, 1766-1768," in *English Historical Review* (London, 1886-), I (1935), 257-77.

the military establishment, it grew out of discussions which had begun as far back as October, 1765, when Viscount Barrington, the secretary at war, had asked Gage for a report on the value of the western posts. Gage's reply had affirmed the value of the posts for maintaining peace in Indian country, but suggested that some of the smaller ones could be abandoned and others reduced in strength, and that the troops thus released might be stationed in the large towns in the east, such as Philadelphia and New York, whence they could be sent wherever they were needed.²⁵ In regard to the Southern district, he suggested that Apalache in East Florida might be abandoned, as well as the posts of Natchez and Fort Bute in West Florida, and that the regiment at Mobile might be withdrawn and the fort there garrisoned from Pensacola; the troops spared from West Florida might be sent to Georgia and South Carolina.²⁶ From this advice, and from that given by others, Barrington drew up a plan of his own in May, 1766, in which, while accepting the main features of Gage's proposals, he suggested that East Florida, whose good land and healthful situation appealed to him, should be made the main station for troops in the southern colonies. West Florida, he argued, was unhealthy and poor in soil; the troops at Mobile should therefore be withdrawn, and Pensacola should have only a small garrison manned from East Florida. Other large bodies of troops should be stationed in Quebec and Nova Scotia, for use in suppressing insurrection on the part of the people of New England and New York, or for service elsewhere.²⁷

In December, 1766, Gage was again consulted about a new distribution of the troops, this time by Lord Shelburne, who had recently become secretary of state for the Southern department. Gage was urged to make the establishment as little burdensome as possible to the people of the older colonies by placing the troops mainly in the "Young Colonies."²⁸ In his reply in February, 1767, Gage proposed a disposition of fifteen

²⁵ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 318-24.

²⁶ *Ibid.*, 324, 352.

²⁷ Lord Barrington's Plan relative to the Out Posts, Indian Trade &c, May 10, 1766, in Alvord and Carter (eds.), *New Regime*, 234-43.

²⁸ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 48-49.

regiments, four in Quebec, one for the Great Lakes posts, two for Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, one for West Florida, two for East Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina together, one for the Illinois and Ohio country, and one each in Pennsylvania, New York, New Jersey, and Massachusetts or Connecticut. The regiment in West Florida was to garrison Pensacola, Mobile, Fort Bute, and Natchez; from the two regiments in East Florida garrisons of one company apiece were to be provided for Apalache, Bermuda, and New Providence in the Bahamas, and four companies for Georgia and South Carolina; the remaining eleven companies were to be stationed at St. Augustine.²⁹

Gage supported this plan, as far as it related to the regiments in the old colonies, by pointing out that these regiments would be "nearly in the Center of America," and, in New York and Quebec, "would in a Manner separate the Northern from the Southern Colonies, which might give Weight and Influence to the Authority of Great Britain in the Political System of America."³⁰ His selection of East Florida as one of the main stations was not specifically explained. The condition of the barracks at Pensacola was deplorable,³¹ but at St. Augustine, as he admitted, it would be necessary to construct new barracks entirely. Assuming that Charleston and Savannah were ruled out as being in old colonies, he perhaps chose St. Augustine over Pensacola because of its better record in relations between the civil and military powers, and because, bad though its harbor was, due to the shallowness of the water on the constantly-shifting bar at its entrance, it was nevertheless nearer by sea to New York and other northern centers than was Pensacola.

The final decision was made in 1768, after Shelburne had left office and the champions of colonial retrenchment had gained the upper hand in the cabinet.³² The new restrictive policy, opposed to westward expansion and the creation of inland colonies which Shelburne had favored, was embodied in the Board of Trade's classic report of March 7, 1768.³³

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 409-10; cf. Alvord and Carter (eds.), *New Regime*, 551.

³⁰ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 124-28.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 139, 159, 300.

³² Alvord, *Mississippi Valley in British Politics*, I, 336 *et seq.*, II, 11-32.

³³ Alvord and Carter (eds.), *Trade and Politics, 1767-1769* (Illinois State Historical Library, *Collections*, XVI; Springfield, 1921), 183-204; cf. 12-21, 77-81.

To implement it in the military establishment, the Earl of Hillsborough, the new secretary of state for American affairs, instructed Gage to reorganize the distribution of the troops on the lines he had already suggested, working out the detailed arrangements as seemed best to him.³⁴

The new disposition of 1768 which Gage drew up, and which differed somewhat from his plan of 1767, made St. Augustine the main station for troops in the Southern district, and the headquarters of the Southern Brigade. The detachments then stationed at Bermuda and New Providence were to be withdrawn to St. Augustine, the West Florida posts of Natchez and Fort Bute abandoned, and Pensacola and Mobile garrisoned by three companies; the remainder of the troops in West Florida were to embark for St. Augustine. This meant that three regiments would be stationed at St. Augustine, with three companies detached for West Florida. In an emergency two of the regiments would be sent wherever needed. Orders to this intent were sent by Gage to Haldimand and the various commanding officers. Haldimand was asked to give advice on the construction of the necessary additional barracks in St. Augustine; pending their completion, the troops from West Florida were to be ordered to encamp near the town.³⁵

These orders drew expressions of delight from the vigorous colonizing governor of East Florida, James Grant,³⁶ and corresponding indignation and protest from West Florida, whose assembly at once drew up a vigorous memorial of protest, while the inhabitants, later supported by similar sentiments from London and Liverpool merchants, protested in an address to the King against the removal of protection from this promising "Emporium of the West."³⁷ None was more outspoken in protest than Haldimand, who had previously recommended Charleston for the Southern headquarters, since shipping could easily be procured there

³⁴ Hillsborough to Gage, April 15, 1768, in Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 61-66.

³⁵ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 175-79, 186-88, II, 481; Gage to Haldimand, June 27 and July 12, 1768, Gage Papers; Gage to Colonel Tayler or Officer commanding 9th Regiment at St. Augustine, June 25, 1768, *ibid.*

³⁶ Grant to Gage, August 25, 1768, Gage Papers.

³⁷ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 208, 218; "Haldimand Collection," 38-39 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1884); Johnson, *British West Florida*, 65-67; *Gentleman's Magazine* (London, 1731-1907), XXXIX (1769), 587-88.

when needed.³⁸ Now his contempt for the Floridas burst forth: nothing but sand, "terrain ingrat," incapable of supporting a planter.³⁹ Frederica in Georgia would, he maintained, have been a much better station. Governor Grant, whom he suspected of having something to do with the decision, deceived himself if he thought to improve his province by drawing troops there; "la debauché, & la Fénéantise qu'Elles y introduiront, Subsisteront longtemps apres Elles; (Cette Province [West Florida] en Sera un Example)." ⁴⁰

Man and nature combined to defeat the plan, whatever its merits may have been. In the first place, Haldimand had great difficulty in taking up transports to move the troops from West Florida, and wrote that it would be easier to embark three thousand men at Philadelphia than three hundred at Pensacola. Gradually the 21st Regiment was embarked at different times in August, September, and October, 1768, but on the voyage several of the transports came to grief. One lost sails and rigging in a hurricane in the Gulf, another lost her mast, and the third struck on the bar of St. Augustine. No men were lost, but baggage and equipment was in some cases badly damaged, in others a total loss. The companies of the 31st Regiment made the journey even more slowly, and the last detachment did not reach St. Augustine till March, 1769.⁴¹ Moreover, the 21st Regiment did not stay long in St. Augustine, for its commanding officer, Major James Chissolm, finding that his men would be obliged to encamp in damaged tents on the site for the new barracks, availed himself of alternative orders from Gage, confirmed by Haldimand, to move his men to Charleston in December, 1768.⁴²

Haldimand himself took his time in transferring the headquarters of the Southern Brigade to St. Augustine. His last letter to Gage from Pensacola was dated December 15, 1768, but he remained there a month

³⁸ Haldimand to Gage, November 30, 1767, Gage Papers.

³⁹ *Id.* to *id.*, December 6, 1767, *ibid.*

⁴⁰ *Id.* to *id.*, October 2, 1768; cf. September 29, 1768, *ibid.*

⁴¹ *Id.* to *id.*, August 28 and 30, September 16, 28, and 29, 1768; Grant to Gage, November 11, 1768, March 5, 1769; Major James Chissolm to Gage, November 8, 1768, Gage Papers; Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 210, II, 492-93.

⁴² Chissolm to Gage, November 8, 1768, St. Augustine; February 14, 1769, Charleston, Gage Papers; Haldimand to Chissolm, November 14, 1768, "Haldimand Collection," 149 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1885).

or two longer, awaiting the arrival of two companies of artillery, and of the new governor, John Eliot. Eventually he made the journey to St. Augustine by land, which took longer than he had expected; but he arrived before the end of April, 1769.⁴³ He stayed for almost exactly a year, before returning to Pensacola. He bought a farm near the town, which he called *Mon Plaisir*, and evidently liked his new headquarters. He lived on excellent terms with Governor Grant, and made several other friends, as his later correspondence shows.⁴⁴

Even during Haldimand's brief stay St. Augustine never had its intended three regiments. The sojourn of the 21st Regiment in Charleston, which was to have been merely for the winter months, was extended into the summer of 1769 in order that the transports which carried it to St. Augustine might be used to take off the 9th Regiment which, after six years in East Florida, had been ordered home. The difficulty of obtaining transports which would brave the hazards of the Florida coast combined with other things to delay the departure from Charleston till September; then nature again intervened, and storms and hurricanes forced the shattered vessels to put back into Charleston after five weeks at sea. Small schooners were then hired to take the regiment to St. Augustine and return to Charleston with the 9th, but even this was not accomplished without mishap, as one of the four schooners, the *Hawke*, was wrecked sixty miles north of St. Augustine, though the passengers, and most of the baggage, were saved. By the end of November, 1769, the arrival of the 21st and departure of the 9th had been completed.⁴⁵ This left a garrison at St. Augustine of the 21st Regiment and six companies of the 31st; the 9th was to be replaced by a regiment from Boston, but for the time being this was delayed.⁴⁶

⁴³ Major Thomas Whitmore to Gage, April 30, 1769; Haldimand to Gage, July 1, 1769, St. Augustine, Gage Papers.

⁴⁴ Grant to Gage, March 24, 1770, Gage Papers; "Haldimand Collection," 501-507 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1886). For conditions in St. Augustine at this period, see Charles L. Mowat, "St. Augustine under the British Flag, 1763-1775," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XX (1941), 131-50.

⁴⁵ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 227-28, 230, 236-37, 239, 240, 244, II, 517, 520-21, 528-29; Gage to Haldimand, May 9 and July 1, 1769; Haldimand to Gage, October 13 and 16, November 28, 1769, February 10, 1770, St. Augustine, Gage Papers.

⁴⁶ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 230.

Meanwhile, events had occurred which upset the new disposition in the Southern district and threatened the military ascendancy of St. Augustine. Lord Hillsborough had, as far back as October, 1768, questioned whether three companies were a sufficient force for the protection of West Florida, and as a result Gage had ordered Haldimand to send back three companies of the 31st from St. Augustine, thus giving West Florida a garrison of six companies. This detachment did not sail from St. Augustine, however, until February, 1770.⁴⁷ By that time bigger changes were in the making. As a result of an insurrection by the French population against Spanish rule in New Orleans, which had occurred in October, 1768,⁴⁸ the Spaniards had sent a new governor, Alexandro O'Reilly, to Louisiana in the summer of 1769 with 3,500 regular troops, a force which seemed too large for the purpose merely of giving the province protection.⁴⁹ As a result, West Florida was strengthened by an additional regiment, the 16th, which was to have replaced the 9th at St. Augustine, but was sent direct from New York to Pensacola instead, early in 1770. At the same time Haldimand was ordered to move his headquarters back to Pensacola.⁵⁰ His departure from St. Augustine was delayed by low water on the bar until April 26, 1770; he reached Pensacola on May 15.⁵¹ The building of new barracks at St. Augustine for the enlarged garrison was suspended, and the military importance of the town eclipsed.

Forces were at work, however, to restore a part of St. Augustine's military prestige. Governor Grant wrote in vigorous terms to Gage and Hillsborough describing the growing prosperity of his province and asking for another regiment.⁵² The fact that by this time various power-

⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, I, 212, II, 76, 493; Gage to Haldimand, January 14, October 3, 1769; Haldimand to Gage, November 28, 1769, February 10, 1770, St. Augustine, Gage Papers.

⁴⁸ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 210.

⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, I, 238, II, 94; Johnson, *British West Florida*, 68.

⁵⁰ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 246; Gage to Haldimand, February 26, 1770, Gage Papers.

⁵¹ Haldimand to Gage, March 21, April 12 and 18, 1770, St. Augustine; June 27, 1770, Pensacola, Gage Papers.

⁵² Grant to Gage, March 24, 1770; Haldimand to Gage, April 11, 1770, *ibid.*; Grant to Hillsborough, March 27, 1770, in Great Britain, Public Record Office, Colonial Office Papers, Class 5, Vol. 551, pp. 42-43 (Library of Congress transcripts); Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 258.

ful persons had obtained land grants in East Florida and had sent over agents to begin settlements probably increased the pressure on the government to reconsider the matter. On the other hand, Hillsborough wrote to Gage in February, 1770, that the reports of the difficulties experienced in transporting the troops convinced him that St. Augustine was "not so proper a station for the Troops as was imagined," and as it would be, but for the dangerous entrance to the harbor.⁵³ In reply, Gage recapitulated the "Plan of the Southern Station," pointing out that the object of concentrating a large body of troops in St. Augustine was to have a force available to be sent wherever needed in an emergency. For this purpose St. Augustine was an inconvenient station, both because of the dangers of the bar and because transports for use there must be hired elsewhere. The last objection applied, however, even more strongly to Pensacola, owing to the greater distance which transports using it would have to travel. For the defense of the provinces concerned Gage proposed a garrison of one regiment in West Florida and another in East Florida. The third regiment for the Southern district would then be available for service wherever needed in emergencies; he left it to Hillsborough to decide whether it should be stationed at Pensacola or St. Augustine, unless South Carolina should be preferred as a station.⁵⁴ Hillsborough's decision, sent to Gage on June 12, 1770, was in favor of St. Augustine, on the ground that, inconvenient as it was, other places were subject to even greater objections.⁵⁵

In obedience to these orders Gage, who had already written, "The Southern Brigade has been moved too often, between the two Floridas,"⁵⁶ informed Haldimand in August, 1770, that it was the King's pleasure that two regiments of the "Florida Brigade," should be stationed at St. Augustine, and the third in West Florida.⁵⁷ Headquarters, however, remained at Pensacola.

This revised plan of 1770, though it brought the resumption of the

⁵³ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 98; cf. 95.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, I, 252 (letter of April 23, 1770).

⁵⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 104.

⁵⁶ Gage to Major Alexander Mackenzie, commanding 31st Regiment, June 23, 1770, Gage Papers.

⁵⁷ Gage to Haldimand, August 28, 1770, *ibid.*

building of barracks at St. Augustine,⁵⁸ was not, however, completely carried out. With the return of the companies of the 31st Regiment which had been serving in West Florida, St. Augustine had, early in 1771, a garrison of two regiments (the 21st and the 31st), less one company of the 31st which was stationed at New Providence.⁵⁹ West Florida's garrison consisted of the 16th Regiment, stationed at Pensacola. In April, 1771, however, the 21st Regiment left St. Augustine for Philadelphia, to form part of an expeditionary force being assembled for an attack on New Orleans, since the British government was momentarily expecting a war with Spain over the Falkland Islands dispute.⁶⁰ Subsequently, the place of the 21st was filled by the 29th Regiment, which was sent from New Jersey and reached St. Augustine in November, 1771, after a tempestuous voyage and some foundering on the bar of the harbor.⁶¹ In the following August (1772) the brigade was again reduced by one regiment, when the 31st was sent from St. Augustine to St. Vincent to help put down the Carib insurrection.⁶² The 31st Regiment was replaced by the 14th in April, 1773, but since the 29th was sent home to England in the following September the force at St. Augustine was again brought down to one regiment.⁶³ It was intended to reinforce this with another regiment, in order to keep the brigade up to its intended strength of three regiments, but with the increasing political troubles in New England this came to be out of the question. By July, 1775, when the military establishment consisted of

⁵⁸ See Charles L. Mowat, "St. Francis Barracks, St. Augustine," in *Florida Historical Quarterly*, XXI (1943), 266-80.

⁵⁹ Gage to Haldimand, February 26 and August 28, 1770; Lieutenant Colonel Edward Maxwell to Gage, May 24, 1770, January 20 and 21, 1771, St. Augustine, Gage Papers.

⁶⁰ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 294-95, II, 117, 121-25; Gage to Maxwell, March 27, 1771; Maxwell to Gage, April 29, May 14 and 21, 1771, Philadelphia, Gage Papers.

⁶¹ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 307, 312, 316, II, 588; Lieutenant Colonel Maurice Carr to Gage, November 3, 1771, Amboy, December 11, 1771, St. Augustine, Gage Papers.

⁶² Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, I, 327, 340, II, 142, 607, 625; Gage to Mackenzie, June 24, 1772; Carr to Gage, August 15 and September 5, 1772, Gage Papers.

⁶³ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 153-54, 156, 639; Gage to Carr, April 1 and 24, 1773; Major Jonathan Furlong to Gage, April 27, 1773, Gage Papers; Carr to Gage, April 28, 1773; Carr to Haldimand, September 26, 1773, "Haldimand Collection," 510, 515 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1886).

twenty-four regiments, two, at Pensacola and St. Augustine, comprised the Southern Brigade; of the remainder, two were at Quebec and Montreal, one was distributed in four posts on the Great Lakes, and nineteen were at Boston.⁶⁴

Long before this, the brigadier's command in the South had lapsed. Haldimand had stayed on in West Florida, with his headquarters at Pensacola, after his return in 1770, transacting the routine business of the district. He was in correspondence with Gage regarding the Falkland Islands dispute and the danger of war with Spain, the possibility of re-occupying the posts on the lower Mississippi, and other kindred matters; he made a tour of various parts of West Florida; and he kept up some correspondence with the commanding officers in East Florida, particularly concerning the disposition of the troops proposed in 1770 and the subsequent troop movements. But effectively his command embraced little beyond West Florida.⁶⁵ In March, 1773, he left for New York to take over the position of commander in chief during Gage's absence in England; he had already, in 1772, been made a major general in America.⁶⁶ No attempt was made to appoint a brigadier for the southern district during his absence, and the command in the two Floridas devolved on the respective local commanding officers. After Gage's return to Boston in May, 1774, Haldimand remained for a time in command at New York, was then transferred to Boston, and returned to England in 1775.⁶⁷ By that time the beginning of the Revolutionary War in the North made the necessity of filling the vacant command in the still-peaceful Southern district seem rather remote.

When war invaded the South also, the forces in the two Floridas were strengthened, and in April, 1777, the commanding officer in East Florida, Colonel Augustine Prevost of the 60th Regiment, another of the Swiss military men in British service, was given the rank of brigadier

⁶⁴ Carter (ed.), *Gage Correspondence*, II, 690-91.

⁶⁵ "Haldimand Collection," 49-57 (*Report on Canadian Archives*, 1884), 153-59, 162-63 (*ibid.*, 1885), 500-508 (*ibid.*, 1886).

⁶⁶ Gage to Haldimand, February 20, 1773; Haldimand to Gage, March 17, 1773, Pensacola, Gage Papers; *Dictionary of National Biography*, XXIV, 16.

⁶⁷ McIlwraith, *Sir Frederick Haldimand*, 96-105.

general,⁶⁸ though no reference was made to the Southern district. Under him the weakly-pressed American invasions of loyalist East Florida from Georgia were repulsed, and a counter-invasion of Georgia, in support of the expedition sent from New York by sea under Lieutenant Colonel Archibald Campbell, was carried out, culminating in the capture of Savannah in December, 1778, and the restoration of royal government in Georgia.⁶⁹ With the subsequent capture of Charleston in May, 1780, the military command of the Southern district was re-established, with Charleston as headquarters; the command was held first by Lord Cornwallis, and from August 31, 1781, to the evacuation of Charleston in November, 1782, by Major General Alexander Leslie.⁷⁰ Meanwhile, though East Florida had not been lost, and had not in fact been attacked, West Florida had fallen to Spanish forces operating from New Orleans in a campaign lasting from 1779 to 1781, when Pensacola capitulated. The command in West Florida during these years was held by another brigadier general, Lieutenant Colonel John Campbell.⁷¹

Finally, in January, 1783, when St. Augustine and the northeast corner of East Florida were crowded with loyalist refugees from Savannah and Charleston,⁷² the officer left in command at St. Augustine, Lieutenant Colonel Archibald McArthur, was given the rank of brigadier general, in command of the Southern district.⁷³ With his departure for the Bahamas in August, 1784,⁷⁴ at the time of the British evacuation

⁶⁸ Great Britain, Historical Manuscripts Commission, *Report on American Manuscripts in the Royal Institution of Great Britain*, 4 vols. (London, 1904; Dublin, 1906; Hereford, 1907, 1909), I, 100.

⁶⁹ For the war in the South, see Edward Channing, *A History of the United States*, 6 vols. (New York, 1905-1925), II, 300-302, 315 *et seq.*; Historical Manuscripts Commission, *American Manuscripts*, I, *passim.*; Lewis W. G. Butler, *Annals of the King's Royal Rifle Corps*, 5 vols. (London, 1913-1932), I, 209 *et seq.*, 306-311; Wilbur H. Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida, 1774 to 1785*, 2 vols. (Florida State Historical Society, *Publications*, No. 9; DeLand, Florida, 1929), I, 71 *et seq.*

⁷⁰ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *American Manuscripts*, II, 132, 143, 326, 344, III, 227, 228.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, I, 323; Johnson, *British West Florida*, 211-18; John W. Caughey, *Bernardo de Gálvez in Louisiana, 1776-1783* (Berkeley, 1934), 149-211.

⁷² Siebert, *Loyalists in East Florida*, I, 105-30.

⁷³ Historical Manuscripts Commission, *American Manuscripts*, III, 327, IV, 247.

⁷⁴ Governor Manuel de Zéspedes to Bernardo de Gálvez, August 9, 1784, St. Augustine, in East Florida Papers, Box 40 (Division of Manuscripts, Library of Congress).

of East Florida and the re-establishment of Spanish government, the last vestige of the Southern Brigade and the Southern district in the British military establishment disappeared. With the exception of the "Western Posts," East Florida was the last piece of territory within the present limits of the continental United States to be evacuated by the British after the Revolutionary War; and with its evacuation, not only the Southern Brigade but the last relic, south of the Canadian border, of the military establishment so hopefully begun in 1763 passed into the limbo of forgotten things.

Annual Report of the Secretary-Treasurer

BY JAMES W. PATTON

By vote of the Executive Council taken by mail during the summer it was decided to cancel plans for an annual meeting of the Association in 1943, and by similar procedure in the early fall it was deemed unwise to undertake an assembling of the Council. Consequently, the business of the Association during 1943 has been transacted entirely by mail.

In October the Council voted to accept an offer on the part of Vanderbilt University to continue for another year the present arrangement for sponsoring the *Journal of Southern History*. Preoccupation with Army and Navy training programs has prevented the Vanderbilt authorities from working out their plan for a more permanent sponsorship, which was anticipated before the end of 1943, but it is understood that this matter will be given attention during the year 1944. Meanwhile, the arrangement now in effect is proving very satisfactory, and the Association is much indebted to Vanderbilt University and to the Managing Editor and his associates for their contribution to this important phase of the Association's work.

The Council also voted that new officers of the Association should be chosen by the same procedure as adopted in 1942. On a ballot prepared by the Committee on Nominations and submitted through the Secretary's office to the membership by mail in November, the following were declared elected at the end of the voting period on December 10: vice-president (1944), Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina; secretary-treasurer (1944), James W. Patton, North Carolina State College; Executive Council members for three-year terms (1944-1946), Lynn M. Case, Louisiana State University, and Ralph B. Flanders, New York University. By provision of the Constitution, the current

vice-president, Dean Wendell H. Stephenson of Louisiana State University, is automatically elevated to the presidency of the Association for 1944.

Upon the nomination of the Managing Editor and by vote taken by mail, the Council elected Professors Rudolph L. Bieseke of the University of Texas and Bernard Mayo of the University of Virginia as members of the Board of Editors of the *Journal of Southern History* for four-year terms (1944-1947), replacing Professors Robert S. Cotterill and Robert H. Woody whose terms expire with the current year.

On December 31, 1942, there were 924 active members enrolled in the Association. Since that date 62 new members have been added, 33 have resigned, and 84 have been dropped for non-payment of dues after being in arrears for twelve months. Four members have been removed by death—Rev. Raymond Corrigan, S. J., head of the department of history at St. Louis University; Lester Coolidge Dickinson, assistant professor of history at The Citadel; Lieutenant William DuBose Sheldon, USNR; and David Yancey Thomas, head of the department of history at the University of Arkansas until his retirement in 1940 and at the time of his death visiting professor of political science at the University of Texas. This yields a net loss of 59 members for the year and a total active membership of 865. Nine of these are life members, this number having been increased by three during the current year. There are also 73 exchange members, making a grand total of 938. Of the active members 55 are in arrears for twelve months, as compared with 98 reported in a similar category at this time last year.

The finances of the Association have been diligently administered and are in a sound condition. All accounts for the year have been paid, and despite the above-mentioned decline in membership, assets have substantially increased during the past twelve months.

Because the secretary receives frequent inquiries concerning the provisions of the constitution and by-laws of the Association, it seems advisable to reprint them at this time as a part of this report for the information of those who have become members since they were last published five years ago.

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

DECEMBER 31, 1943

Balance as of January 1, 1943:

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$750.00	\$5,250.00
Interest accrued but not collected, 1940-1942	350.00
2 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$740.00	1,480.00
Interest accrued but not collected, 1942	10.00
Total investments	<u>\$7,090.00</u>

Checking account, Wachovia Bank and Trust Company, Raleigh, North Carolina	1,559.28
Total	<u>\$8,649.28</u>

Receipts, January 1 through December 31, 1943:

Annual dues collected	\$2,634.50
Sale of extra copies, back files, and reprints, <i>Journal of Southern History</i>	137.75
Life memberships	150.00
Interest on Savings Bonds, accrued but not col- lected	158.00
Total receipts	<u>\$3,080.25</u>
Total to be accounted for	<u>\$11,729.53</u>

Disbursements, January 1 through December 31, 1943:

Printing:

<i>Journal of Southern History</i> , February and May issues	\$1,223.04
Title pages and index, 1942	99.65
Authors' reprints	302.27
Materials for membership committee	14.57
Stationery and supplies	27.62
Copyright fee	2.00
Bank charges	7.61
Refund on overpaid account	2.70
Secretary's stipend	300.00
Postage	42.11
Total disbursements	<u>\$2,021.57</u>
Balance as of January 1, 1944	<u>\$9,707.96</u>

ANALYSIS OF BALANCE

Investments:

7 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$750.00	\$5,250.00
Interest accrued but not collected, 1940-1943 . . .	490.00
2 U. S. Savings Bonds @ \$740.00	1,480.00
Interest accrued but not collected, 1942 and 1943	28.00

Total investments	\$7,248.00
-------------------------	------------

Checking account, Wachovia Bank and Trust Com-
pany, Raleigh, North Carolina

2,459.96

Total

\$9,707.96

Constitution and By-Laws of the Southern Historical Association

CONSTITUTION

I.

The name of this organization shall be The Southern Historical Association.

II.

Its purpose shall be the encouragement of the study of history in the South, with particular emphasis on the history of the South.

III.

All persons who are interested in promoting the purposes of this Association are eligible for membership therein.

IV.

The Association shall hold one annual meeting and such other meetings as the council may call.

V.

The officers shall be a president, a vice-president, and a secretary-treasurer. The vice-president shall succeed to the presidency. Other officers shall be elected at each annual meeting as provided in the by-laws, and shall hold office for one year or until their successors are qualified.

VI.

There shall be an executive council consisting of the president, the vice-president, the secretary-treasurer, the managing editor of *The Journal of Southern History*, ex-presidents for a period of three years following the expiration of their terms of office, and six additional members, two of whom shall be elected at each annual meeting for a term of service of three years each.

VII.

The duties of the council shall be to: (1) decide upon the time and place of the annual meeting of the Association, and to call such other meetings as it may think advisable; (2) appoint the managing editor and the board of editors of *The Journal of Southern History*; (3) fill vacancies which may occur in any office until the beginning of the next calendar year; (4) prepare a budget and handle

the business of the Association; (5) formulate and propose to the Association plans for carrying its purposes into effect.

VIII.

The constitution and by-laws may be amended by a vote of two thirds of the members present and voting at the annual business meeting. Any proposed amendment shall be submitted to the secretary-treasurer and must be sent by him to the members with the notice of the annual meeting.

BY - LAWS

I.

The annual dues of the Association shall be \$3.00. Upon payment of \$50.00 any person may become a life member, exempt from the payment of further dues.

II.

The fiscal year shall begin on January 1. Terms of office shall begin on the first of January following regular election.

III.

Elections shall be by ballot at the business session of each annual meeting. Nominations shall be made by a nominating committee and may be made by any member from the floor.

IV.

The president shall appoint annually a committee on program, a committee on nominations, a committee on membership, and such other committees as the council or Association shall authorize. The committee on nominations shall consist of five members, one of whom shall serve a second year and be chairman of the committee his second year.

V.

The official organ of the Association shall be *The Journal of Southern History*, which shall be distributed to all members. The policies of the *Journal* shall be determined by the managing editor and the board of editors, eight in number. Members of the board of editors shall serve four years, two to be chosen each year.

VI.

A quorum shall consist of fifteen members.

Notes and Documents

LAND SPECULATION PROFITS IN THE CHICKASAW CESSION

BY JAMES W. SILVER

For two centuries speculation in western lands in the United States allured ever larger numbers along its entrancing path to labor-free riches, and, until the growth of the modern corporation, ownership of land was the main indication of a man's wealth. The role of speculation in our western development has long been acknowledged by historians, and much has been written of its influence. Because of obvious difficulties, however, very little has been published about the success or failure of speculation in regard to its primary purpose—that of profit. Apparently this driving force behind the speculator has been of minor interest to the historian. It is still true, however, that many a student of frontier history has had his curiosity aroused as to whether land speculation paid the dividends hoped for by its devotees.

The present case study is an effort to satisfy that curiosity in regard to the financial returns, not to certain individuals or to land companies, but to the speculators as a whole in a given restricted area.¹ The problem has been to discover, by examining the deed books and the other

¹ Composite figures regarding the acreage, investment, profit, length of time land was held, selling and buying prices per acre, and the annual return to the speculative agencies, resulted from the combination of many transactions. The aggregates come from a detailed examination of Tippah County Deed Records, Books A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, J, K, L, M, N, O, P, Q, R, S, T, U, V, X, Y, Z, 1, 2, 3, 37, Tippah County Abstract Book, and Tippah County Range Book, in Chancery Clerk's Office, Ripley, Mississippi; DeSoto County to Tate County Deed Records, Books A, B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, Marshall County to Tate County Deed Records, Book A, Tunica County to Tate County Deed Records, Book A, and Tate County Deed Records, Books A and B, in Chancery Clerk's Office, Senatobia, Mississippi. See Mattie Russell, "Land Speculation in Tippah County, 1836-1861" (M.A. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1940), and Edwin Chapman, "Land Speculation in Tate County, 1836-1861" (M.A. thesis, University of Mississippi, 1942).

land records of certain Mississippi counties, the profit made by those who bought land for speculative purposes.²

The last of the treaties with Mississippi Indians, made at Pontotoc in 1832, resulted in the Chickasaw Cession. From the ten thousand square miles involved, ten counties were formed in 1836 and about the same number at varying later dates down to 1873. Some inquiry was made into the records of several of these counties, but the conclusions arrived at have come mainly from a concentrated study of Tippah County, formed in 1836, and Tate County, created from Tunica, Marshall, and DeSoto counties in 1873. Tippah County, in the extreme northeastern part of the state, may be considered a typical hill region, and Tate, at least in the Coldwater River district, has some of the marks of the Delta.

In the United States between 1835 and 1837, 29,000,000 of the 38,000,000 acres of public land sold were acquired for speculation.³ Even in the arbitrarily restricted sense of the definition of a speculator as used in this paper, more than 600,000 acres, or about sixty per cent of the land in Tate and Tippah counties, were held by speculators.⁴ It

² From the start, a great many difficulties plagued the investigation and made impossible a complete check on speculation profits, but enough information was found for some reasonably safe generalizations. As closely as possible the land records of speculators were checked from 1836 to 1861 for the purpose of discovering the amounts of money invested, the acreage involved, and, above all, the profits obtained. Speculators were arbitrarily defined as all land companies, partnerships, and individuals owning at any given time as many as two thousand acres of land. It is evident that many individuals and partners engaged in speculation on a smaller basis, but it is certainly true that no one family could hope to farm, in the years concerned, more than two thousand acres. Perhaps a smaller figure should have been chosen, but that would not have materially changed the results of the present study.

Often deeds were missing and others were found faulty, but the greatest difficulty arose from incomplete information, as when a deed recorded the transfer of land for "love and affection," or for "ten dollars and other considerations." Some individuals and most companies held land in several counties and often in other states as well, making complete recording impossible. That, of course, did not change the profits on the individual plots in Tate and Tippah counties, except where lands in several counties were sold in one transaction. In such a case only the average price per acre could be estimated. Improvements on land could not be determined but they were made only rarely by speculative agencies. Speculation in town lots was ignored, although it might be added that such ventures were on a limited scale in the rural sections of Mississippi concerned.

³ Paul W. Gates, "The Role of the Land Speculator in Western History," in *Pennsylvania Magazine of History and Biography* (Philadelphia, 1877-), LXVI (1942), 315.

⁴ By plotting on a map each parcel of land involved in speculation, it was found that approximately 62 per cent of Tate County was at one time or another between 1836 and 1861 held for price advances.

seems reasonable to suggest that at least eighty per cent of the Chickasaw Cession land at one time or another was held by persons anticipating speculative profit.

Of the 6,718,586.27 acres of land in the Chickasaw Cession, the land office had disposed of 4,033,594 by 1850. Individual Indians had patented some two and one half million acres more, most of which soon fell into the hands of white settlers or speculators. These acres had brought in a total of \$3,336,732.32, or an average of \$.827 per acre. Government sales of Chickasaw lands were made as follows:⁵

<i>Year</i>	<i>Acres</i>	<i>Selling Price</i>
(Sold at Choctaw Agency)	8,193.98	\$ 10,320.30
1836	1,304,150.42	2,168,602.53
1837	192,622.58	328,895.72
1838	281,367.39	195,020.05
1839	639,452.52	246,101.88
1840	437,654.49	78,273.86
1841	304,143.64	46,356.21
1842	74,727.66	10,658.28
1843	36,345.04	6,221.86
1844	124,269.19	78,352.59
1845	161,365.39	51,811.11
1846	185,414.96	60,059.22
1847	138,128.64	31,674.88
1848	74,403.40	13,638.62
1849	36,419.17	6,160.36
1850	34,936.18	4,584.85

Land was sold at prices ranging from four dollars an acre to as little as four cents. The lowest figure resulted when it was discovered that after the choice lands had been sold for at least the minimum of \$1.25 per acre, lagging sales did not produce enough revenue to pay the salaries of land officials. These agents were instructed to liquidate government acreage for what it would bring.⁶

Nine land companies, nineteen partnerships, and forty individuals engaged in speculation in the counties of Tate and Tippah between

⁵ *Senate Documents*, 31 Congress, 2 Session, II, no. 2, pp. 12-14.

⁶ W. S. Binley, Chief, Indian Lands Division, General Land Office, United States Department of Interior, to writer, January 19, 1940.

1836 and 1861.⁷ The individuals were about evenly divided between residents of Mississippi and those of other states, which included Alabama, Tennessee, Georgia, North Carolina, Massachusetts, and New York. Members of partnerships came from outside Mississippi in the ratio of three to one, and an overwhelming majority involved in land companies came from without the state. The source of investment is indicated in such names as New York and Mississippi Land Company, Boston and New York Chickasaw Land Company, North Carolina Land Company, Boston and Mississippi Cotton Land Company, and the Georgia Company Association. Seven of the companies, three of the partnerships, and four individuals invested in lands in both Tate and Tippah counties.

The Georgia Company Association made a profit of slightly more than \$50,000 over a two-year period on an investment of \$23,000 in 12,000 acres of Tippah land. The New York and Mississippi Land Company invested \$17,000 in 11,000 acres in Tate County and profited to the extent of \$24,000, but its transactions took place over a twenty-five year period, and the same company gained \$22,000 from an investment of \$14,000 in 13,000 Tippah County acres over a period of forty years. These profits which may at first glance seem very large, actually amount to an annual return of between four and six per cent. Three agencies show profits between \$5,000 and \$10,000 on investments ranging from \$3,700 to slightly more than \$5,000. These transactions took place over periods of from seven to twenty-four years, with the annual

⁷ Efforts to untangle the complicated transactions of the companies and partnerships led in many cases to disappointment. Much more often than in the case of individual speculators, complete information could not be secured from the deed books. Some difficulty could be charged undoubtedly to definite efforts, especially among professional land agents, to hide such information as buying and selling prices, but many times the very nature of a transaction precluded the gathering of statistics on even a county-wide basis. For example, a parcel of Tippah land might be bought along with thousands of acres in other parts of the Chickasaw Cession or even outside the state, and then sold with an entirely different grouping of acres, or by itself for "ten dollars and other considerations." Some individuals were connected with several partnerships and at the same time engaged in speculation by themselves. In two instances, partners bought and sold individually as well as for two or three land companies each. The transactions which could be completely traced included slightly more than one third of the 295,000 acres held at one time or another in Tippah and Tate counties by partnerships and companies. With these deficiencies in mind, it is still possible to obtain a representative picture.

returns as low as three and as high as twenty per cent. These transactions, with those of six other partnerships are indicated as follows:

<i>Name</i>	<i>Acreage</i>	<i>Investment</i>	<i>Profit</i>	<i>Years Held</i>	<i>% Annual Return</i>	<i>Price per Acre</i> <i>Buying Selling</i>	
Georgia Company							
Association	11,559	22,829.02	51,437.05	2	112.5	1.975	5.93
New York-Mississippi Land Co.							
(Tate County)	11,160	16,963.20	23,659.20	25	5.6	1.52	3.71
New York-Mississippi Land Co.							
(Tippah County)	12,560	13,941.60	22,231.20	40	4.0	1.11	2.88
Peters and							
Maclin	3,360	5,250.80	8,574.72	9	18.1	1.565	4.12
New York-Chickasaw Land Co.	2,400	3,744.00	7,987.20	24	8.9	1.56	4.89
Ross-Huntington							
Heyer	2,880	4,680.00	6,525.08	7	19.9	1.625	4.07
Whitsitt, Cook							
and Niles	3,200	4,160.00	4,332.80	3	34.7	1.30	2.66
Anderson and							
Saffarans	2,560	3,200.00	4,278.72	4	33.4	1.25	2.06
Saffarans and							
Lewis	1,760	2,200.00	2,200.00	1.167	85.7	1.25	2.50
Carothers and							
Clemens	14,400	20,664.00	1,728.00	2	4.2	1.435	1.555
Bolton and							
Carothers	14,400	16,128.00	1,672.00	1	10.4	1.12	1.24
Lane <i>et eux</i> ⁸	3,680	6,721.60	712.00	1	10.6	1.83	2.02

It should be realized, of course, that this study makes no effort to go into the complete business of any company or partnership. Some of them engaged in buying and selling hundreds of thousands of acres of land.⁹ The figures indicated above are concerned only with acreage in Tate and Tippah counties whose complete records can be traced. In no case did a partnership or land company actually lose money.

⁸ At the time of the sale of this land in 1837, Lane also sold 14,900 acres of Chickasaw Cession land outside of Tate County for the same price per acre.

⁹ One company bought only 960 acres in Tippah County but owned more than 25,000 acres in other parts of the Chickasaw Cession. Henry Anderson and Edward Orne bought 20,160 acres of land in Tippah and 37,760 acres in Tate County, but there is no way of

Much more complete information has been assembled in regard to the activities of thirty-one individual speculators in these lands. Almost exactly half of these speculators lived within the state of Mississippi. They were likely to be farmers, lawyers, county officials, agents for land companies, and in a few instances, doctors and preachers. Their usual procedure was to buy their land from other white men, although large quantities were purchased from Indians or directly from the government in original patents.

The largest speculator in Tippah County lands, R. J. Thurmond, who moved to Ripley from North Carolina, is not included in this study because most of his investments came after the Civil War. It is true, though, that in the 1850's on 4,846 acres with an investment of \$5,-075.07 he lost three hundred and thirty-five dollars.¹⁰ Colonel William C. Falkner, soldier, editor, lawyer, author, and railroad builder, also speculated in Chickasaw lands on a grand scale after the war. Before 1860 he profited to the extent of \$3,990 on an investment of \$13,070 in two thousand acres of land.¹¹ The rapid depreciation in value of the investment of John Trezevant, of Memphis, may be explained by the fact that he purchased his land in 1857 and sold it in 1865.¹²

In all, approximately three hundred and thirty-seven thousand acres were held in the two counties by single investors. These holdings included from two thousand to thirty thousand acres of land. Eight men held from three to four thousand acres each; six from four to five thousand acres; four from five to six thousand acres; and three from six to seven thousand acres. One individual owned between ten and fifteen thousand acres, two from fifteen to twenty thousand, and only one over twenty-five thousand.

finding out what they sold them for. When Anderson and Orne split their partnership, they divided more than 245,000 acres of land. Orne, a native of Massachusetts, was the land agent for the Boston and Mississippi Cotton Land Company, the New York, Mississippi and Arkansas Land Company, and the Boston and New York Chickasaw Land Company. Tippah County Record Book F, 177-78; DeSoto County to Tate County Record Book A, 468.

¹⁰ Tippah County Record Book M, 61.

¹¹ Tippah County Record Book H, 378, *passim*.

¹² Tippah County Record Book Q, 498, *passim*.

INDIVIDUAL LAND SPECULATORS

Name	Acres	Investment	Profit	% Annual Profit	Years Held	Price per Acre	
						Buying	Selling
Armour, William	5,600	14,000.00	6,000.00	504.7	1/12	2.50	3.57
Bradford, John	3,840	4,961.60	5,293.40	15.0	7	1.29	2.67
Burford, L. P.	920.5	2,227.61	2,315.39	5.5	19	2.42	4.935
Davis, James	3,200	6,656.00	3,209.00	12.0	4	2.08	3.08
Davis, Orlando	11,963	9,271.32	19,436.66	4.0	53	.775	1.62
Ellis, James	8,527	9,763.41	13,803.74	6.4	22	1.145	2.765
Evans, L. W.	3,680	632.96	1,170.64	15.4	12	.17	.49
Fort, James	16,182	7,200.99	1,183.20	.7	23	.445	.53
Foster, Booker	4,177	9,765.33	11,978.10	4.9	25	2.34	5.155
Green, C. A.	16,926	4,563.02	13,202.28	8.3	36	.27	1.05
Hopkins, John	2,963	1,066.68	1,301.98	24.0	5	.36	.795
Kendrick, Allen	4,210	3,915.30	13,293.68	20.0	17	.99	3.15
Leake, Francis	4,320	11,793.60	6,177.60	2.2	24	2.73	4.16
Lewis, Felix	5,920	16,576.00	3,693.57	2.8	8	2.80	3.42
Lucas, Peter	4,547	10,412.73	6,464.07	3.2	19	2.29	3.71
Mansfield, Sam	3,360	873.60	9,168.38	135.5	7	.26	2.99
Matthews, Joseph	26,352	18,004.88	32,922.72	4.1	45	.685	1.925
Meriwether, Chas.	4,300	11,137.00	35,094.38	10.5	30	2.59	10.75
Miller, Charles	2,240	6,239.60	1,510.80	.8	28	2.79	3.46
Mills, Charles	5,760	8,774.40	5,529.60	31.5	2	1.525	2.485
Niles, Thomas	6,080	8,512.00	1,788.00	1.3	16	1.40	1.69
Orne, Richard	3,920	4,272.00	5,090.60	7.9	15	1.09	2.38
Peters, Thomas	7,360	13,027.20	15,222.80	16.7	7	1.77	3.53
Saffarans, David	5,120	7,984.80	7,440.77	6.7	14	1.535	3.01
Stricklin, Hardy	6,260	9,202.20	10,580.70	3.6	32	1.47	3.16
Trezevant, John	3,040	10,000.00	7,000.00*	8.7*	8	3.29	.985
Watson, John	2,119	1,875.31	315.31*	.9*	19	.885	.735
Weaver, Philip	3,040	3,475.60	1,474.40	2.5	17	1.14	1.625
White, Benjamin (Tate County)	3,440	13,990.80	5,665.80*	2.4*	17	4.08	2.42
White, Benjamin (Tippah County)	4,320	12,203.00	7,015.73	2.0	28	2.825	4.77
Whitsitt, John	6,320	9,164.00	11,806.36	5.6	23	1.45	3.32
Wilie, John	7,360	15,839.25	4,636.80	2.0	15	2.15	2.78

Totals 197,376.5 267,382.19 244,824.24

Averages 18.6 1.35 2.59

*Loss

Three speculators invested between fifteen and twenty-five thousand dollars, eight between ten and fifteen thousand, seven from eight to ten thousand, four from six to eight thousand, three from four to six thousand, three from two to four thousand, and four less than two thousand dollars.

Two speculators recorded profits of more than thirty thousand dollars, three from fifteen to twenty thousand, five from ten to fifteen thousand, nine from five to ten thousand, and three from three to five thousand, seven less than three thousand, and three actually lost money.¹³ These profits, however, do not give the complete picture, for the two most successful speculators had their money tied up for thirty and forty-five years, respectively, and this meant an annual return of only ten and four per cent, respectively. Two of three speculators held their land more than ten years and almost half for more than twenty years. Only two individuals were involved over a period of less than five years.

It would seem, then, that the most important figure of all is the percentage return on each investment per year.¹⁴ Only three individuals obtained a return of more than twenty-five per cent. William Armour's gain was a freakish 515 per cent because he sold out a \$14,000 investment at a \$6,000 profit one month after its purchase. Only ten speculators indicated an annual return of more than ten per cent, and a distinct majority profited less than five per cent per annum. The yearly return of more than a third came to less than three per cent.

It seems quite reasonable to conclude that many people who risked

¹³ Benjamin Aspinwall White, resident of Baldwin County, Georgia, is listed as having both profited and lost in land speculation because of curious circumstances. He bought 35,360 acres of land in the Chickasaw Cession, 7,680 in Tippah, and 1,760 in Tate. The selling prices of 4,320 acres of the Tippah land and 3,440 in and around Tate County indicate a profit in the first case and a loss in the second. Moreover, the complete transaction is known concerning only about one-fifth of White's land and the average selling and buying prices may be somewhat erroneous. This case indicates some of the problems involved in such a study, and shows why only general conclusions may be drawn.

¹⁴ The percentage figure is too small in many cases because it is based on the erroneous assumption that a speculator's entire investment was tied up from the beginning to the end of his speculation. As a matter of fact, the turnover for a part of his transactions may have been much more rapid. The longer the period of speculation the more chance there is for error on the conservative side, but this would be partly compensated for by the increased burden of taxation.

their wealth in northern Mississippi were doomed to disappointment.¹⁵ An occasional bonanza proved to be the exception to the rule. The land companies, on the whole, seem to have reaped greater profits than individual speculators. Those who came into the state to live and invested in more land than could be used were likely to receive modest returns from their speculations. In most cases greater success with much less risk could have been secured in commercial enterprises in the more settled Eastern communities. The present study adds confirmatory evidence that many buoyant hopes and expectations of speculators in frontier farm lands faded into disillusionment under the harsh light of reality.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF *The Slaveholder Abroad*

BY H. PRENTICE MILLER

The Slaveholder Abroad, a volume of fictional propaganda, was published anonymously in 1860 by the J. B. Lippincott Company.¹ No authorship seems to have been assigned until 1890, when William Cushing attributed it to William Tappan Thompson;² and numerous other writers have followed Cushing on this point.³ The fact that two other important bibliographical works have assigned the authorship to

¹⁵ Joseph Schafer, in his remarkable land study of Wisconsin, incidentally comes to the same general conclusion as the present writer in regard to profits from speculation in farm lands. Schafer, *Wisconsin Domesday Book, Town Studies*, I (Madison, 1924), 10-11.

¹ The complete title was: *The Slaveholder Abroad; or, Billy Buck's Visit, with His Master, to England: A Series of Letters from Dr. Pleasant Jones to Major Joseph Jones, of Pineville* (Philadelphia, 1860).

² William Cushing, *Anonyms: A Dictionary of Revealed Authorship*, 2 vols. (London, 1890), II, 624. Cushing fails to give his evidence, which conceivably was nothing more than the fact that the book purported to be a series of letters to Major Joseph Jones, a name used as a pseudonym by William Tappan Thompson.

³ See, for example, William P. Trent et al. (eds.), *The Cambridge History of American Literature*, 4 vols. (New York, 1917-1921), II, 510; Allen Johnson and Dumas Malone (eds.), *Dictionary of American Biography*, 20 vols. and index (New York, 1928-1937), XVIII, 480; John D. Wade, *Augustus Baldwin Longstreet* (New York, 1924), 382; Walter Blair, *Native American Humor* (New York, 1937), 194.

Ebenezer Starnes,⁴ however, raises a question which demands an examination of the evidence of authorship for both men.

First it may be pointed out that any claim for attributing the authorship to William Tappan Thompson has significant weaknesses. Thompson did not mention this work in two personal letters in which he discussed every volume he is known to have written, even the editing of a law book.⁵ He was so zealously pro-southern that he very likely would have given special emphasis to *The Slaveholder Abroad* if he had written it. The obituary notice in the *Savannah Morning News* discusses all of Thompson's known books, but is silent about this one.⁶ The book is not mentioned in the innumerable notices and comments found in the family scrapbooks,⁷ nor do the older standard works on southern literature say anything about it when they discuss Thompson's writings.⁸

On the other hand, the history of *The Slaveholder Abroad* seems to begin in 1853, when Ebenezer Starnes, noted lawyer of Augusta, Georgia, published a series of letters in the *Milledgeville Federal Union*.⁹ Addressed to Governor Howell Cobb, these letters were pro-slavery arguments which sought to prove that there was much less crime in the South than in England.¹⁰ In them is the basis of *The Slaveholder Abroad*. When the volume was in press in 1860, advanced sheets were sent to William Tappan Thompson, then editor of the *Savannah Morning*

⁴ Joseph Sabin *et al.* (comps.), *Bibliotheca Americana*, 29 vols. (New York, 1868-1936), XXIII, 216; Leonard L. Mackall (comp.), *Catalogue of the Wymerly Jones De Renne Georgia Library*, 3 vols. (Wormsloe, Ga., 1931), II, 614.

⁵ Letters to Salem Dutcher, October 16, 17, 1866. These are now in the possession of Mrs. Lewis E. McIntosh of Quitman, Georgia. Though Thompson studied law for a time, he never practiced.

⁶ *Savannah Morning News*, March 25, 1882.

⁷ One scrapbook is now in the possession of Mrs. Lewis E. McIntosh of Quitman, Georgia; another is in the hands of Mrs. Walter Barron Williams of Haddock, Georgia.

⁸ See, for example, James W. Davidson, *The Living Writers of the South* (New York, 1869), 574; Samuel A. Link, *Pioneers of Southern Literature*, 2 vols. (Nashville, 1900), II, 525-28; Louise Manly, *Southern Literature* (Richmond, 1907), 307-308; Edwin A. Alderman *et al.* (eds.), *Library of Southern Literature*, 16 vols. (New Orleans, 1908-1913), XII, 5283-86. See also the sketch of Thompson in James G. Wilson and John Fiske (eds.), *Appleton's Cyclopaedia of American Biography*, 7 vols. (New York, 1887-1889), VI, 95-96.

⁹ The leading newspaper in Milledgeville, Georgia, then the state capital.

¹⁰ These letters were reprinted and may be found in the extant files of the *Savannah Morning News*, May 28, June 4, 14, 24, 1853; January 26, February 3, 7, 1854.

News. In publishing some of these letters with favorable comments, Thompson stated that *The Slaveholder Abroad* was "from the pen of a distinguished Georgian," and that it was "the work of a distinguished jurist of Middle Georgia."¹¹ Ebenezer Starnes fits this description, for he had been a judge of the Middle Court of Georgia before being appointed to the Georgia Supreme Court.¹² There is, furthermore, a strong tradition in the Starnes family that Ebenezer Starnes was the author.¹³ This volume, moreover, is attributed to him by his alma mater.¹⁴ The presentation inscription in an extant copy appears to be in Starnes' handwriting.¹⁵ Finally, when cataloguing this book in 1893, the Library of Congress was informed by the Lippincott Company that the author was "Hon. E. Starnes of Augusta, Ga."¹⁶

All the evidence adduced seems to furnish conclusive proof that Cushing was in error in his statement of authorship, and that Ebenezer Starnes rather than William Tappan Thompson was indisputably the author of *The Slaveholder Abroad*.

¹¹ Savannah *Morning News*, January 23, March 1, 1860.

¹² Letters and Records of Ebenezer Starnes, in the Department of Archives, State of Georgia.

¹³ Letter from Mrs. Lucia Berrien Starnes (John F.) Monroe, of Athens, Georgia, April 10, 1937.

¹⁴ Sketches of the Alumni of the University of Georgia (Bound manuscript data compiled about 1900, now in the University of Georgia Library), Vol. VIII.

¹⁵ Copy now in the Emory University Library.

¹⁶ Letter now in the Catalogue Division of the Library of Congress. The Lippincott Company records have since been destroyed by fire.

Book Reviews

The Soul of a Nation: The Founding of Virginia and the Projection of New England. By Matthew Page Andrews. (New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1943. Pp. xvi, 378. Appendix. \$3.50.)

The enthusiastic statement of the publishers that this "is, in every sense, the definitive history of the ill-fated Jamestown colony" is misleading and would hardly receive the considered endorsement of the author. Actually, Mr. Andrews has—deliberately, it seems—written a narrative of uneven proportions, expanding at length at some points and contracting at others; for his primary objective appears to have been to assemble, collate, and otherwise subject to historical criticism, all the known sources on the founding of Virginia for the purpose of correcting serious errors and of filling in gaps and supplying detail in the history of the first successful English colony. This being true, the book would appeal more to those who have a good knowledge of early Virginia history than to the general reader; and as a critique of the sources it would certainly be of great value to one setting out to master this field of history.

It will be recalled that the history of Virginia as a corporate colony had three important phases: first, the period under the original charter from 1607 to 1609, when the colony was governed locally by a council and a president elected by this council; second, the period from 1612 to 1619, under the more liberal charters obtained by Edwin Sandys, when the colony was controlled locally by a governor assisted by a council; and, finally, the period from 1619 to 1624, when an elective legislative assembly formed part of the local governing body. It is in the first period that the author obviously finds more error to be corrected and more detail to be supplied; for this is the period of the residence in Virginia of Captain John Smith, who by his own accounts of his adventures was the original Paul Bunyan. Historians have sharply divided on the veracity of Smith's several accounts of happenings in the colony as set forth in his *General Historie of Virginia*, and his *True Relations*. Some have contended that, although a braggart, Smith's accounts were essentially true, while others have accorded him a high rank among the great liars of history. Since his writings are by far the fullest accounts of this period in Virginia history and have been relied upon so heavily even by those who consider Smith a big liar, Mr. Andrews' careful evaluation of Smith's narratives as historical sources is important. By checking the accounts against each other and finding glaring inconsistencies, and by checking them with other contemporary accounts, such as George Percy's *Discourse* and

his *Trewe Relation* and Edward Maria Wingfield's *A Discourse of Virginia*, the author demonstrates that Smith cannot be trusted, and that such stories as Smith's rescue by Pocahontas and the Indian girl's romantic attachment to Smith after her marriage to Rolfe are subject to serious doubts. Finally, the credit Smith claims for having prevented the colonists from starving is fictitious: conditions under Smith's rule were worse, if anything, than under the other presidents.

In dealing with the two periods 1609-1619 and 1619-1624 the author gives added emphasis to the generally accepted fact that the liberal Edwin Sandys as head of the Virginia-London Company was responsible for the establishment of local self-government in Virginia; that, indeed, his struggle to obtain this boon for Virginia was a part of his struggle at home against the growing despotism of the king. He slights the internal history of the colony under Dale, Gates, and Delaware—perhaps because of the fact that this is fairly well-known history—but gives a detailed account of the conduct of the first legislative assembly.

Throughout the book, Mr. Andrews drives home the points—which are certainly well taken because of the Godless reputation accorded Virginia by some historians—that one of the most persistent and powerful motives in establishing the colony of Virginia was to civilize and Christianize the Indians; and that the London Company under the direction of Sir Edwin Sandys was as greatly concerned over the religious welfare of the colonists themselves as were John Cotton and John Winthrop over that of the Puritan settlers of Massachusetts.

Vanderbilt University

FRANK L. OWSLEY

The Negro in Colonial New England, 1620-1776. By Lorenzo Johnston Greene. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 494. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1942. Pp. 334. Appendices, bibliography. \$4.50.)

The proslavery school of the ante-bellum South could have made profitable use of the facts that Professor Greene has discovered regarding slavery in colonial New England. That Puritanism was not inherently antislavery has long been clear from the history of the New England slave trade; but its peculiar adaptation to slaveholding has not been so obvious. The author makes it evident, however, that slavery was relatively mild in New England, not only because of economic factors, but also because of the Old Testament emphasis on certain personal rights of slaves. Puritans, who accepted the Bible literally, preferred a status for their slaves close to the Old Testament idea of "servants." Cotton Mather taught the idea that Negroes were enslaved because they had sinned against God; hence the divine necessity of complete obedience to one's master. Roger Williams, the apostle of tolerance, condoned the slavery of "Adam's degenerate seed."

The proudest names of New England from the Faneuils and the Cabots down were intimately associated with the slave trade or with slaveholding directly. Anti-slavery sentiments came at the close of the colonial era when economic and

climatic factors had clearly shown that slavery was unprofitable. But as late as 1764, some five thousand families in Massachusetts alone owned in the aggregate a similar number of slaves.

New England Negroes, as Professor Greene shows, were engaged in far more diversified activities than was the free Negro in the South, ranging from farm work to whaling. Connecticut even reported six Negro slaveholders in 1790! Sometimes desperate white workers mobbed their Negro competitors; and in one case, at least, they secured legislation banning Negro workers in certain occupations. This is of course familiar in southern history. Not a few New England Negroes fought in every colonial war as well as in the Revolutionary War, which is said to have involved three thousand colored patriots. In 1752, Boston's population included 1,541 Negroes—one-tenth of the total figure. This city remained the most populous Negro center of colonial New England. Slave insurrections, free Negro outbreaks, and runaway slaves and servants led to a policing system not wholly unlike its southern counterpart with the usual background of community fear and panics. Advertisements indicate that slave families were often broken up when it suited the purchaser.

Although the author does not press the contemporary implications of his study, it is obvious that he has supplied an important corrective to our present interpretation of southern slavery. When environmental factors become unfavorable to tolerance, the practices of morality and ethics seem to change, as witnessed in the increased race tensions today in northern as well as southern cities. Historically, the proslavery aspects of Calvinism in the plantations of the West Indies, the Presbyterian South, and colonial New England offer a revealing contrast to the emancipationist sentiment of liberalized Calvinism in industrial New England of the 1850's and its equivalent in Old England. Finally, the reviewer would like to add that his own experiences with the scattered New England sources dealing with the Negro leads him to appreciate the author's ingenuity and industry in reconstructing the faded picture of Negro history in early New England. In view of the contradictory nature of the statistics upon which he has been forced to rely, he has displayed admirable caution in his conclusions.

Post-Doctoral Fellow
Social Science Research Council

HARVEY WISH

Calendar of Maryland State Papers; No. 1, The Black Books. Edited by Elizabeth W. Meade, Emil Fossan, and Roger Thomas. ([Annapolis]: The Hall of Records Commission, 1943. Pp. viii, 297. \$1.00.)

"The Black Books" emerged from a mass of heterogeneous records sent by the governor of Maryland for examination to Brantz Mayer, local historian. Mayer divided them into rough chronological groups, tied them in bundles and returned them to the governor in 1866. One such group comprising ten bundles he labeled, "Proprietary and Royal Period," 1636-1785. He advised binding each

group in a different color and suggested crimson for the proprietary and royal period. It was, however, finally bound into twenty black folio volumes containing nearly sixteen hundred manuscript papers and known as "The Black Books."

According to the Calendar, three-fifths of the papers have never been printed and of the remaining two-fifths, one-ninth are merely referred to in the *Archives of Maryland*. But three of the documents have seventeenth century dates, about five-sixths concern late proprietary Maryland, and the rest Maryland under the royal, revolutionary, and confederation periods. For years they remained inadequately calendared. Though some attempts were made to put them in order, they were neither arranged chronologically nor indexed, and the searcher who wished to exhaust a subject had to page through the entire twenty volumes. His difficulties are well illustrated by considering the location of the 141 items for the year 1760. These are scattered over eleven volumes—114 in volume X; four each in volumes II, VI, VIII, and IX; three each in V and XI; two in IV; and one each in I, III, and VII.

This Calendar remedies that condition and greatly simplifies the researcher's task. The papers are arranged chronologically, with the date in the left margin of the page; a short, clear statement of content in the center; and, in the right margin the calendar number, the papers being numbered consecutively. Immediately under the calendar number are the volume and item number in the "Black Books."

Unfortunately, the chronological order within the year itself is not always followed. Approximately 110 items for the year 1760, for example, deal with the Boston fire of March 2. On May 6, the governor of Maryland issued an appeal in behalf of the Boston sufferers. Eleven items relating to donations for their relief appear before his request, though probably all—certainly two, 978 and 989—were the direct result of his appeal. These two specifically state that they are collections made "... by virtue of his Excellency's Brief."

In addition to this chronological guide, the searcher is provided with an exhaustive name-place index, a rich field for the genealogist; a far less adequate subject index, which gives a poor idea of content; and a finding list by which an individual having the Black Book number can locate the corresponding calendar number.

The editors have done a difficult job well and have started a series which should prove of inestimable value to the student of Maryland history.

University of Maryland

HAYES BAKER-CROTHERS

The Revolutionary Generation, 1763-1790. By Evarts Boutell Greene. (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1943. Pp. xvii, 487. Bibliography. \$4.00.)

The writing of social history, rather neglected in this country until recently, has not yet developed a technique of its own. At best, it could give life and form

to the dry bones of the political framework of civilization. At worst, it could degenerate into an amorphous mass of meaningless information. Lacking a central theme, it does not take shape of itself, but its frontiers are so vast and its details so multifarious that a pattern must be found if it is to have meaning.

The Schlesinger and Fox *History of American Life* has long since taken its place as the most extensive and ambitious work along this line yet to be undertaken in America. Professor Greene's volume in the series covers the period from 1763 to 1790. The "social significance of the Revolution" has not escaped the notice of earlier writers, but no one has covered the ground so broadly and in such detail as it is here covered. Not only is information extensive, but it is displayed with a marked catholicity of interest. There is no over-emphasis on any phase or region, and the discussion is distinctly objective.

Details judiciously selected from the broad field of social history should reveal general trends in the development of civilization. These trends are not neglected in the present volume, but the author has been most conservative in the matter of generalizations, and in only one instance does it seem that he can be accused of an "interpretation." He makes it clear that he does not consider that the frontier was a peculiarly constructive force in the development of American institutions. For instance, on page 178 he remarks that "the frontier experience was not pure gain. The settlers lacked not only the material comforts of an older society but some of the higher values as well."

The reviewer believes that more interpretation would have been desirable, even though it inevitably invites controversy. Even the homely details of existence, such as eating and drinking habits—the gradual substitution of whisky and applejack for Madeira, of coffee for tea, and of an earlier dinner hour in place of the colonial three o'clock repast—reveal significant trends in the American way of life, and they are not unconnected with frontier conditions and political developments. But history, as well as art, is long, and spadework must be done before construction is possible. Professor Greene has accomplished an excellent job of spadework.

University of Virginia

THOMAS PERKINS ABERNETHY

The War Governors in the American Revolution. By Margaret Burnham Macmillan. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 503. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. 309. Appendices, bibliography. \$3.50.)

Mrs. Macmillan has brought together a great deal of information in this straightforward volume. Beginning with the well-warranted assumption that, in contrast to the military, congressional, and diplomatic leaders, the war governors have received far less than their due, she traces every phase of their multiple activity through the war years. In so doing, though her emphasis is administrative rather than biographical, she throws light on some shadowy personalities

of the period and on such strong figures as George Clinton and William Livingston. There can be no quarrel with her insistence that the war governors had much to do with the ultimate American victory, a fact abundantly testified to by contemporaries as diverse as George Washington and the English generals.

In the first months of the war colonial experience weighed more heavily than any other factor in severely restricting the executive branch. Even the newly elected governors themselves accepted without question the desirability of legislative leadership, a concept which in some instances went so far as to assume that executive authority could be adequately handled by committees of correspondence or of safety. Moreover, many moderates believed that the struggle would soon end in a compromise and that makeshifts would suffice. When, however, independence became the goal and the temporary instruments proved unsatisfactory, the war governor appeared. To define his role was no easy task. In only one case, Jonathan Trumbull of Connecticut, did a *colonial* governor become a *state* executive.

Although the temporary committees could not long survive as executives, they had an important part in tiding over a difficult period when relations between the states and with the Continental Congress were undefined and the exact nature of the new executive awaited formulation. In this period the opinions of John Adams had considerable weight, and his was the most positive voice raised against plural executives—the unhappy experience of Pennsylvania assuredly bore him out—and in behalf of a quick settlement of the issue. Generally speaking, this settlement was effected by the legislature, not the people, of a colony. Under the circumstances restrictions were to be expected. One-year terms were common; re-election was limited in seven of the colonies; control of legislative action was widely forbidden. These conditions in a few instances rendered the office a farce, but fortunately common sense usually triumphed over constitutional restrictions—which themselves tended to decline—and though the governor might confine himself to execution he performed that function up to the hilt.

Executive authority varied through a number of factors, but as the war dragged on that authority often increased, especially where fighting was frequent (except in the case of Georgia which quickly fell to the British and was in consequence the scene of unmitigated chaos). This authority was expressed alike in statutes that may well be considered constitutional and in short-term emergency grants of power. Yet much had to depend on the governor's own initiative, for he must constantly improvise: precedents were lacking; news was scarce; "not even the supply of writing paper was any too abundant." Fortunately, irrespective of earlier hostility, the office had great prestige which carried its holder over many rough spots.

This came out especially in dealings with Congress, which placed "great reliance" upon the governor, even to the extent of bestowing powers upon him. Between governors and Congress there passed a heavy correspondence dealing with finance, army administration, and post-war settlements. Usually peaceful,

the relations occasionally became very touchy, but the great wonder is that they were not far more acrimonious. Similarly, the governors had intimate dealings with the army, whose commanders were often compelled to call upon the executives for help in matters of pay, discipline, and impressment of men and supplies. A modest but by no means insignificant tribute to Washington was the widespread confidence he inspired among the war governors. Part of this no doubt resulted from their own command of the militia which gave them insight into the responsibilities of military leadership. The threat of invasion, the activities of Tories and Indians, the problems of the commissariat were only a few of the demands that made the governor a figure of first-rate importance to the army.

Meanwhile he must carry on the civilian routine, and though William Livingston was perhaps unique in his emphasis on this side of his office, several others at least saw, if they could not adequately fulfill, their responsibility. "Politics" in the party sense was adjourned, though personal factors might at times operate extensively. On the whole, scandal had little opportunity; fighting the British was work enough for every one. That the result of the fighting turned out the way it did was in no small measure the achievement of the war governors. We are indebted to Mrs. Macmillan for so complete an account of that achievement.

University of Missouri

CHARLES F. MULLETT

The Philosophy of Thomas Jefferson. By Adrienne Koch. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. xiv, 208. Bibliography. \$2.50.)

Miss Koch, for this very penetrating study, used the voluminous Jefferson manuscripts, printed collections of Jefferson's letters and works, books belonging to Jefferson upon whose pages he made suggestive marginalia, and special works dealing with aspects of Jefferson's thought. The result is an original examination of Jefferson's philosophical ideas, presented with considerable care and precision. The book is divided into three parts: Part one: Ethics ("Education and Philosophical Sources," "Jefferson and Bolingbroke," "Moral Sense," "Morals and Religion," "Utilitarianism"); Part two: Philosophy and Ideology ("Philosophical Debut," "Jefferson and Ideology," "The Doctrine of Ideology," "Cabanis and the Issue of 'Materialism,'" "Jefferson's Philosophical Beliefs," "Classification, Words, and Knowledge"); Part three: Theory of Society ("On Human Nature," "History and Social Progress," "Political Relativism," "Natural Rights," "Republicanism," "Wards," "Education," "Political Economy," "Jefferson and Tracy's 'A Treatise on Political Economy'"). The Conclusion bears the title: "The Perennial Significance of Jefferson's Thought."

The author correctly contends that Jefferson scholars have not fully cultivated the materials available for developing more thoroughly Jefferson's non-political thought; when they do they will conclude that, although Jefferson was not a technical philosopher in the narrow, formal use of the term, he persistently

attempted to view all of life philosophically. Indeed, Jefferson was pre-eminently a practical philosopher who knew that a theory to be good must be practical, and that what was practical and useful was also good theory. America and its experience, he concluded, was novel in the history of civilization; its mission was to prove that a free and an educated people could by a dependence upon reason and inquiry govern itself successfully, avoiding the pitfalls of tyranny whether of the one, the few, or the many. To improve the lot of the generality stood as a worthy goal toward which to work. Ideas for Jefferson, therefore, were useful in so far as they related to the promotion of these great objects.

One of the distinguishing marks of this study is the thoroughness with which the author has examined the ideological connections of Jefferson and his European contemporaries and near contemporaries. This is particularly helpful in the case of her treatment of Jefferson and Destutt de Tracy and others of the Paris *Ideologues*, among whom the intellectual interrelationships have not hitherto been adequately delineated. Jefferson found in Ideology a congenial philosophical system; he was not, however, slavish in his acceptance of these principles, that being completely foreign to his character. The reviewer thinks that this work, along with many others, is inclined to rely too heavily upon Jefferson's commonplace books and the publications of others read by Jefferson as indices to the sources of his ideas. The works of other authors should perhaps be considered as expressions of concepts independently achieved by Jefferson rather than as causes. Miss Koch is conscious of this danger of interpretation, however, for she warns the reader that Jefferson was not the kind of a person to accept uncritically the conclusions of others without refashioning them in harmony with his own primary assumptions.

The author places great stress upon Jefferson's philosophical method as the key to an understanding of his thought. This method in the hands of a man possessed of great intellectual curiosity and passionately devoted to the investigation of all fields of knowledge for ideas and information to be used in the progressive struggle to improve the lot of mankind in America is of critical significance. Comparatively early in his life, Jefferson found in his reading of Bolingbroke a caveat closely consonant with his own thought: "No hypothesis ought to be maintained if a single phenomenon stands in direct opposition to it." Jefferson developed what today would be called a positivistic method of scientific analysis. With this method he proceeded to attack all of the basic problems of society and he emerged with common-sense attitudes toward morality, religion, social and political relationships, knowledge, and education. One cannot but conclude with the author that Jefferson earned the title of philosopher.

Miss Koch has performed a valuable service for all who have interested themselves in the exciting adventure of exploring the thought of the great American; the serious student of Jefferson is greatly in her debt. It is to be hoped that she will continue her researches along the lines established in this essay looking

forward to a more mature and complete analysis of the philosophy of Thomas Jefferson.

Stanford University

GEORGE HARMON KNOLES

American Negro Slave Revolts. By Herbert Aptheker. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 501. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. 409. Bibliography. \$4.50.)

In the introductory chapter of this book Mr. Aptheker explains that several years ago, while preparing a master's thesis on the Southampton slave insurrection of 1831, he came to the conclusion "that this event was not an isolated, unique phenomenon, but the culmination of a series of slave conspiracies and revolts which had occurred in the immediate past." He suspected that a similar situation might exist with respect to other outstanding insurrections and plots and, therefore, "that an intensive study of the entire subject might uncover hitherto neglected aspects of the life of the Negro people, and the role of the institution of slavery in the history of the United States" (p. 11). *American Negro Slave Revolts* constitutes his report on that study.

Either by design or by accident, the plan of organization and the method of treatment afford a rather striking revelation of a conflict between two ideas in the mind of the author which culminates in an apparently whole-hearted acceptance of one of them and a consequent marshalling of evidence to justify his choice. In Chapters II to VII he discusses such general questions as fear of rebellion, machinery of control, causes of rebellion, and the character of contemporary information. In doing this he seems to be torn between the desire on one hand to show that much of the white man's fear of slave rebellion was the result of imagination or of exaggerated reports and the uncritical acceptance of hearsay evidence, and thus that he did not have adequate grounds for such protective or repressive measures as were taken, and on the other hand to show that the slaves were not submissive.

Beginning with Chapter VIII, however, the first of these two alternatives seems to drop out of the picture, and the remainder of the book is devoted to a narration of "approximately two hundred and fifty revolts and conspiracies" (p. 162), ranging in time from an uprising in the short-lived Ayllon colony of 1526 to a series of conspiracies in widely scattered sections of the South in 1864, and in location from the North Atlantic states to Texas. A few of these were major outbreaks; others were plots still in the planning stage; and still others which had no stronger foundation than rumor are presented as questionable. On the basis of this collection of evidence, the author arrives at the conclusion "that discontent and rebelliousness were not only exceedingly common, but, indeed, characteristic of American Negro slaves" (p. 374), although nothing in his discussion throws any light on what proportion of the total number of slaves was involved in such activities.

At the beginning of this part of his study Mr. Aptheker states that the tests which he has applied in determining the existence of insurrection or conspiracy are: "a minimum of ten slaves involved; freedom as the apparent aim of the disaffected slaves; contemporary references labelling the event as an uprising, plot, insurrection, or the equivalent of these terms" (p. 162). These are, of course, rigorous requirements; but in following his use of the information which he furnishes we are forced to the conclusion that he has neither limited himself as rigorously as his definition promised nor escaped altogether the temptation confronting all who write in devotion to a thesis—a too sympathetic evaluation of the data available. He seems too prone, for example, to accept reports found in papers far removed from the scene or known to be openly antagonistic to slavery, without securing a confirming report from a local source. Two cases chosen more or less at random may be cited as illustrations. We are told that in February, 1820, at Petersburg, Virginia, "The attention of the people . . . was entirely engrossed by an insurrection of the blacks" (p. 266), and the only authority cited is an issue of the *New York Evening Post* carrying letters said to have been written from Petersburg by persons not named for us. Again we are told (pp. 94-95) that seventeen Negroes were hanged in Culpeper County, Virginia, in 1862, while "the greatest consternation imaginable" reigned among the whites in that section; this on the strength of reports in the *Washington Republican* and the *Liberator*, both in sections engaged in war against Virginia and the Confederacy. In neither case is a local source cited. Granting that southern papers upon occasions played down such rumors for fear of doing the community a hurt, it is hardly probable that disturbances of such magnitude could have existed without receiving some mention in Virginia papers. To our own knowledge news of the Southampton insurrection appeared in the Richmond press in a matter of days and that before the extent of the plot could have been fully established.

While the author seems to have done an enormous amount of research and to have uncovered sources from near and far, a close study of his documentation shows glaring weaknesses in spots. In the section dealing with the debate in the Virginia legislature following the Southampton insurrection there is but one reference to the journal of the house of delegates and not one to the senate journal, and yet he undertakes to correct what he calls an erroneous tradition concerning the senate vote by citing, not the journal but the *Richmond Whig*. Perhaps this accounts for the hopelessly confused paragraph at the top of page 318, in which events are given in incorrect order, individuals wrongly identified, and the impression conveyed that a series of actions extending from January 11 to January 25 had all occurred in a much shorter period.

There is a disturbing disregard for the correct form of proper names: for example, "Teras" for Teran (p. 82), "Carolina" for Caroline (pp. 85, 127), "Ravenal" for Ravenel (p. 106), "Witches" for Witcher (p. 318), "Northup" for Northrup (p. 334), and the consistent misspelling of the name of John C.

Breckinridge. On page 314, note 73, the page cited for a quotation from Thomas Ritchie does not contain the quotation nor any mention of Ritchie. The date of Brodnax's speech (p. 317, n. 79) should be given as January 13 instead of January 19, 1832. The index, thanks to its brevity, might have been omitted with but small loss.

On the whole, this study of American Negro slave revolts may be of real service in calling again to our attention the fact that not all those associated with slavery lived in sweet contentment or undisturbed security. The author is to be commended for his success in turning up data which apparently was neglected or unknown by some who attempted to write in this field before him, but it is to be hoped that his treatment will not be accepted as the final word on the subject.

Western Maryland College

THEODORE M. WHITFIELD

Ante-Bellum Kentucky: A Social History, 1800-1860. By F. Garvin Davenport. (Oxford, Ohio: The Mississippi Valley Press, 1943. Pp. xx, 238. Bibliography. \$3.50.)

This is an excellent survey of social and intellectual development in Kentucky during the ante-bellum period. Professor Davenport makes no claims to any new discoveries. Neither does he attempt to assign to Kentucky a position unique among the states of the Old West. On the contrary, he prefaces his book with the statement that there "was little in Kentucky that was peculiar. Kentucky society resembled the life of the growing nation and was a part of it. The early histories of Lexington and Nashville were poured from the same mould. The Bluegrass of Kentucky had much in common with Middle Tennessee and both sections reflected certain features of life in Virginia and North Carolina." The principal contribution of the book is its presentation of a readable narrative of the progress of a frontier people, which included "poverty stricken drudges and men of wealth, ignoramuses and men of genius, conservatives and liberals, men with the love of God in their souls and others who made sport of the pious."

Professor Davenport begins with a description of country life. The life pictured here was that of the majority of Kentuckians, but it was not productive of such progress as that made by town folk. To many readers the chapters on the development of education will prove most interesting. The author, a member of the faculty of Transylvania College, traces with interest and apparent pleasure the struggles and contributions of that institution. He thinks that the lack of consistency in leadership and public support prevented the College from attaining greatness. Its patrons, always few in number, could never agree whether the College "was to be a symbol of Calvinistic Presbyterianism," a center of culture, or a school for the training of young men in "democracy and statecraft." On the other hand, the dissension at Transylvania stimulated the growth of Centre College and the University of Louisville. The author found "no unified movement in Kentucky for a public school system. Instead there was opposition and in-

difference, aristocratic prejudices and political incompetence." But progress was made in spite of these handicaps, and much of the credit is given to such leaders as Robert J. Breckinridge and Benjamin O. Peers.

Kentucky was very much affected by the Great Revival, an emotional upheaval which brought many converts into the churches, the Baptist and Methodist especially. Those interested in church history will enjoy Professor Davenport's treatment of the Revival and the schisms within the ranks of the Baptists and Presbyterians which led to the organization of the Christian and Cumberland Presbyterian churches.

In the field of science, ante-bellum Kentucky made both negative and positive contributions. The disciples of Cookeism "hastened the downfall of the calomel quacks and the mercury doctors," while such men as Drake, Dudley, and Gross made positive contributions to scientific knowledge.

The last two chapters are devoted to literature and art, and include samples of literary products of the region. The few pages on the development of newspapers might well have been expanded into a full chapter.

Ante-Bellum Kentucky can be read and appreciated both by scholars and by general readers. It is attractive in appearance and sound in content. More careful proofreading would have eliminated many typographical errors. In the interest of the preservation of paper all sources except manuscript materials were omitted from the bibliography. Few historians will object to this omission, but many will wish that a more detailed description of the numerous manuscripts had been included. Those who are interested in Professor Davenport's sources will be inconvenienced by the necessity of turning to the back of the book for the notes and citations.

Birmingham-Southern College

JOSEPH H. PARKS

The British Traveller in America, 1836-1860. By Max Berger. *Columbia University Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*, No. 502. (New York: Columbia University Press, 1943. Pp. 239. Bibliography. \$3.00.)

A century ago the United States was in the vanguard of the democratic procession. Jacksonian Democracy, with practically universal manhood suffrage, was at its crest and proudly proclaimed that "all men are created equal." To this land of equality flocked millions of English and European immigrants who looked upon the United States as the promised land. Europe, too, was in the throes of social change and political fermentation. The partially successful revolutions of 1830 had not been forgotten when a new crop broke out in 1848. While England was not seriously affected by the revolutions, she did have her great Reform Bill and her Chartist and Free Trade movements. Hence the English people were intensely interested in how democracy was working in the United States.

Between 1836 and 1860, some two hundred and sixty English travellers

toured the United States and wrote their impressions of American society. These writers, generally from the upper middle classes, commented upon almost every conceivable aspect of American life. The author of the work under review has studied the accounts of these travellers and gives us herewith what they found. After an introductory chapter on the travellers themselves, Professor Berger limits his study to chapters on the face of America, customs and character of the people, democratic government, slavery, religion, education, and emigration. He has given a clear and understandable picture of American society as seen by the English travellers. He does not often attempt to correct their errors but is content to let them speak for themselves. Hence while some of the judgments quoted are shrewd and accurate, others are fantastic and inaccurate.

In general little adverse criticism is to be offered. It does seem to the reviewer, however, that the author shows a pet aversion to the South, and thus gives a more hostile picture of that region than the travellers intended. For instance, he quotes several adverse criticisms of southern food but totally ignores Miss Martineau's classic statement about the quality of the planters' menus. The author's description of G. W. Featherstonhaugh's *A Canoe Voyage* as a "diary of an explorative mission in the upper Mississippi Valley" is misleading since it ignores the fact that Featherstonhaugh visited and described the gold region of the Southern Appalachians. There are some few errors in spelling.

There is a remarkable similarity between this work and an unpublished doctoral dissertation prepared by William E. Chace at the University of North Carolina in 1941. Not only are the general organization, the chapter headings, and the inclusion of biographical notes in the bibliography similar, but several direct quotations and other illustrative materials are identical. The records of the Library of the University of North Carolina show that Professor Berger borrowed a copy of Doctor Chace's study in January, 1942, and used it more than four months. Despite these facts there is not a single acknowledgment to Doctor Chace's study other than its inclusion in the secondary bibliography.

University of North Carolina

FLETCHER M. GREEN

Kendall of the Picayune: Being his Adventures in New Orleans, on the Texan Santa Fe Expedition, in the Mexican War, and in the Colonization of the Texas Frontier. By Fayette Copeland. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1943. Pp. 351. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.00.)

On the jacket of this book George Wilkins Kendall is summarized as "the most adventurous editor of his time, who made history by living it in New Orleans, Texas, and Mexico." The marker erected by the state of Texas to designate the county which it named in his honor describes him as "Poet, journalist, author, and farmer; one of the founders of the New Orleans Picayune; member of the Santa Fe expedition; most successful sheep raiser in the Southwest." The superlatives in these statements, together with the wide range of interests reflected

both in them and in the title of the book, might seem to suggest a resort to exaggeration and sensationalism in order to "build up" a character or a career which would appeal to an uncritical reading public. As one follows Mr. Copeland's handling of his subject, however, he soon becomes convinced that in the case of Kendall such claims can be confirmed by the searching and sifting processes of history.

Kendall of the Picayune is more than the biography of a ubiquitous business man—for Kendall himself was much more than that—and more than the story of an interesting and adventurous life. It is at least a partial history of an important period in our national development, an era of significance in many fields: industry, transportation, communication, foreign affairs, and territorial expansion; for the curiosity, the zest for living, and the desire for first-hand knowledge which Kendall possessed brought all phases of such activities into his realm of interest and his life.

Following a New England childhood, Kendall spent twelve years of his early life in wandering through the region east of the Mississippi, educating himself in the school of experience. He worked as a typesetter or at any other job which opportunity offered, and in 1837, at the age of twenty-eight, settled in New Orleans to found the *Picayune*, which continued as one of his major interests throughout the remaining thirty years of his life. His new venture was not a pretentious paper in any sense of the word. It was small in size and sold for the smallest coin then in circulation in Louisiana, the Spanish picayune; but his adeptness in poking fun at politics and engaging in cross-country banter with other papers together with his "sense" for the type of news that the people in his distribution area wanted soon assured the success of the enterprise.

It was Kendall's association with the Texan Santa Fe expedition of 1841, however, that first brought him into national prominence. By writing the two-volume *Narrative of the Texan Santa Fe Expedition* he became to the expedition what Caesar was to the Gallic Wars, and the expedition itself was perhaps as important in its influence on national expansion as were the Gallic Wars to the destiny of Rome. With this experience both Kendall and his paper reached maturity and both moved firmly into the arena of national and international affairs. Through his writings in the *Picayune* he brought the Texas question before the people of the United States and as interest in Texas and Mexico was heightened the eastern papers came to depend upon his paper for news from that part of the world.

The Mexican War confirmed Kendall as a national figure in the newspaper world. He had predicted that the annexation of Texas would bring on war with Mexico, and following his star of prophecy he was on the border when the fighting began. Although there were many newspaper men who saw the opportunity of combining soldiering with reporting, Kendall was the most successful and has come to be generally accepted as the world's first front-line war correspondent. His system of messengers to carry his letters out of Mexico and on to

New Orleans became so famous and operated so successfully that before the war was over his express was being used to carry the official army reports. When peace negotiations were completed in Mexico, the official messenger to Washington was given a two-day start on the *Picayune* correspondent, but the *Picayune* giving the details of the treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo was on the streets of New Orleans ahead of the official messenger. Kendall then used the system to get copies of this edition to Washington before the messenger reached there, and it was from the *Picayune* that the people of the United States, from New Orleans to New England, first learned the terms of the treaty.

Shortly after this scoop Kendall went to Europe, where he reported the revolution in France and the rise of Louis Napoleon for the *Picayune*. There followed several years of residence in France during which he married; but in 1856 he established his wife and family on an extensive ranch near New Braunfels, Texas, where he began the work of developing improved breeds of sheep which was to establish his reputation as one of the outstanding ranchers of the Southwest. Despite his absorption in ranch life, he continued to write for the *Picayune* with more or less regularity, and his last great contribution to its editorial policy came at the close of the Civil War when he urged a return to the land—the practice of sound agricultural policies—as the only salvation for the country.

Although the form of the title seems to place the emphasis on Kendall and the *Picayune*, this reviewer would rate Kendall significant on four counts and in the following order: (1) as the historian of the Santa Fe expedition; (2) as the world's first front-line war correspondent; (3) as a pioneer in the raising of improved breeds of sheep and goats in the Southwest; and (4) as the founder and editor of the New Orleans *Picayune*. Mr. Copeland has made an excellent contribution on the last three of these points and has followed traditional sources on the first in a satisfactory manner. He presents Kendall's life in a vivid and moving style. His writing is never tedious or dull. The book has happily been chosen by the Texas Institute of Letters as the best Texas book of 1943.

University of Texas

H. BAILEY CARROLL

James Moore Wayne, Southern Unionist. By Alexander A. Lawrence. (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943. Pp. xiv, 250. Bibliography, illustrations. \$3.00.)

This is a biography of a Georgian who has received very little attention in history, despite the fact that he played an important role in both state and national affairs. Had he not chosen to remain loyal to the Union when Georgia seceded in 1861, he might have been held in higher esteem by his southern contemporaries; but his first love was the Union and there was an impelling force within that would not allow him to support his home state in its steps toward secession.

James Moore Wayne's chief claim to fame rests in his excellent record as an associate justice of the United States Supreme Court, which position he held from the time of his appointment by Andrew Jackson in 1835 until his death in 1867. Being a staunch Jackson Democrat, he reflected many of the Jacksonian principles in his Court opinions. At times he was said to have out-Marshalled John Marshall in his views concerning the national government, and in 1852 he was referred to as one of the two "most hightoned Federalists on the bench" (p. 93). Despite the fact that Wayne was much opposed to the protective tariff, he denounced nullification as "false in theory and in practice disastrous to our country" (p. 55). As to slavery the Judge believed in the "positive good" (p. 144) of that institution, and was a slaveholder of some note himself. He contended that time was the only cure for the practice of slavery. In the Dred Scott case Judge Wayne concurred "entirely in the opinion of the court" (p. 156), as it was read by Chief Justice Taney. His long period of service on the bench tended to strengthen his views of nationalism and when he died he possessed a greater love for the American Union than ever before.

Prior to his acceptance of the justiceship of the Supreme Court, Wayne held numerous public offices in the state of Georgia. His political career began in Savannah, where he was born and reared. He was first elected to the legislature for a term, and was then made mayor of Savannah. He left that post to accept the judgeship of the Eastern circuit of the Superior Court of Georgia, and later served three terms in the United States Congress. In 1833 he was chosen president of the state constitutional convention to consider the reduction in members of the General Assembly. Throughout the 1830's, when Georgia was torn between the State Rights and Union factions, Wayne strongly supported the latter group.

Mr. Lawrence has done an excellent job in showing the impact of this prominent Southerner in political and legal circles during a very trying time in American history. He pictures Wayne as a man who loved both state and nation, and who, like Benjamin H. Hill, Herschel V. Johnson, and Alexander H. Stephens, was heart-broken when Georgia followed South Carolina out of the Union in 1861. His relation with the national government at the time no doubt influenced his stand against the Confederacy.

A large part of the book deals with the inner workings of the Supreme Court for the thirty-two years of Wayne's tenure of the bench. Being a lawyer himself, the author is interested mainly in the legal career of the Judge. Although he has used all of the available records on Wayne's life, there seems to be a great deal lacking. Perhaps some day more of the Wayne papers will be found, and the life of this outstanding Georgia Unionist may be completely written. The present work, however, is a valuable contribution to Georgia history, and the author, a layman in the field of historical writing, is to be commended upon his interesting style and his clear and concise manner of presentation.

Judah P. Benjamin: Confederate Statesman. By Robert Douthat Meade. (New York: Oxford University Press, 1943. Pp. xiv, 432. Illustrations, bibliography. \$3.75.)

Judah P. Benjamin, like many other adopted sons of Louisiana, played an important role in the history of the United States. Born of intelligent and honorable but poor parents in 1811 in the British West Indies, this Sephardic Jew came to North Carolina with the Benjamin family at the age of two. Nine years later the family moved to Charleston and in 1825 young Benjamin entered Yale. He left college under a cloud during his junior year and finally settled in New Orleans in 1828 without money or friends. His rise to national eminence as a lawyer was phenomenal; and his successful business ventures made him financially independent.

Benjamin entered the field of politics as a Whig and served Louisiana as a member of the lower house of the state legislature, as a member of the 1844 constitutional convention, and as a state senator. As a member of the constitutional convention, he made definite and positive contributions which caused him to be regarded as a liberal in spite of his agreement with the Southern Democrats on the slavery question. He supported Zachary Taylor for president. As the result of the fight between John Slidell and Pierre Soulé for state control of the Democratic party, Benjamin, with the assistance of Slidell, was elected United States senator for the term beginning in 1853. With the formation of the Republican party and the disintegration of the Whig party, Benjamin became a Democrat and was re-elected to the Senate in 1859. As senator, he attained national prominence, and his contacts with the Secretary of War, Jefferson Davis, later proved profitable, for he served in the cabinet of the Confederate President as Attorney General, as Secretary of War, and finally as Secretary of State. Following Appomattox, Benjamin escaped to England and claimed successfully the right to British citizenship on the grounds that he was born on British soil. He entered his chosen field of law and added new luster to his reputation by becoming in a short time a leader of the British bar.

There has long been a need for a biography of Benjamin and the delay has been occasioned by the fact that the nature of the man has precluded the portrayal of a vibrant personality. Consequently, the student of history welcomes Professor Meade's detailed account of his long and busy life. An author determines the points of emphasis, yet the reader may regret the lack of details bearing upon certain incidents. For example, it appears that a fuller and more detailed treatment of Benjamin's relations with Davis might throw new light upon the internecine warfare of the Confederate leaders. If the chapters dealing with Benjamin's career as a cabinet member were as full as those devoted to his career as a member of the British bar, the study would be of more value to students of American history. However, this is a matter of personal judgment as to what use might be made of available material.

Errors in spelling (for example, "principle" for principal, p. 360, and "Pinchbeck" for Pinchback, p. 361) do not detract from the merits of the book, but the abbreviated bibliography is quite disconcerting to this reviewer. A check of the notes to ascertain the materials used by the author is confusing and the use of certain sources is questionable. For example, the *Saturday Evening Post* makes no pretense of being a historical publication (Chapter VII, note 12); and it is unusual, to say the least, to cite "Ripley's 'Believe It or Not' syndicated newspaper feature" as a source without any designation of the publication or the date on which it appears. A few examples taken from the notes are illustrative of faulty footnoting: Chapter I, note 3, does not give the full title of the newspaper; Chapter I, note 6, cites a publication without giving adequate bibliographical information concerning it; and in view of the statement at the head of the bibliography that the notes contain "further references with bibliographical data," there are far too many instances where the first citation of a work fails to give the full name of the author, the full title, and the place and date of publication (see, for example, Chapter I, notes 18, 51, 52; Chapter II, notes 2, 7, 12; Chapter III, notes 4, 10, 17, 27; *et seq.*). While regrettable errors of this nature are too prevalent for good historical writing, the author has made a useful contribution to the field of southern biography.

During the twelve years that Professor Meade devoted to the study of Benjamin, he evidently explored and utilized all available known source material bearing upon his subject. The author's treatment has been objective; he has neither eulogized nor condemned Benjamin; he has recited facts and left the reader to evaluate the man. Students of political history will find that the volume contains valuable information and will wish to add it to their collections of biographical studies of public men.

Louisiana State University

WILLIAM B. HATCHER

The Urban Impact on American Protestantism, 1865-1900. By Aaron Ignatius Abell. *Harvard Historical Studies*, Volume LIV. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1943. Pp. x, 275. Bibliography. \$3.75.)

The social history of the United States is in need of much investigation, and especially is this true in the realm of religious development. In the present study Mr. Abell has probed deeply into the religious and social effects of the rapid growth of the city on American Protestantism between 1865 and 1900. His findings show that although a purely spiritual religion satisfied the rural people, the poor inhabitants of the cities needed and demanded champions for their social, physical, and moral needs. For the most part the Protestant churches in America failed to face these demands for remedial measures until late in the nineteenth century. Their relief systems humiliated the poor instead of constructively aiding them. On the other hand, the Catholic Church sympathized with the working people and prospered in the large centers of population.

After 1880 the Protestants at last became aware of the significance to churches of the urban growth. Much of their indifference had resulted from an almost complete absence of industrial conflict. Beginning with the strikes of 1877, the Protestant churches received a rude awakening to the dangers of class conflicts and of anarchy. Imminent peril faced the religious organizations that were led by churchmen "who, with so splendid an opportunity for service, expended their energies on theology and in dry, doctrinal sermons" (p. 66) which failed to meet the needs of the hour. Furthermore, the wage earner believed that the Catholics understood his needs and that the Protestants were aligned with his oppressors.

Protestant leaders soon saw the wisdom of urging the churches to develop social service programs. Hereafter, the church, to succeed, must see the new trends in American social life and play a new part in a new world. In order to achieve a satisfactory program, the Protestant churches had to build and to organize agencies that would promote social justice and permit the poverty stricken to aid themselves. Although sponsored by no church, the Salvation Army led the way for American Protestantism to discard purely spiritual religion. Still other modifications led to the development of the institutional church which was "the religious phase of the increasing determination to implement under rural conditions the inherited ideals of humanitarian democracy" (p. 164). Practical Christianity had arrived in earnest.

The ministry had suffered from a hidebound and thoroughly impractical training. As the social problems became more acute, the seminaries, arising to meet the needs, introduced courses in sociology. In due time there came from the seminaries a new type of minister, who preached social Christianity.

By 1900 the Protestant churches, influenced by such leaders as Washington Gladden, R. Heber Newton, and Richard T. Ely, had met the urban challenge by adapting religion to the environment. A minority of the Protestants feared that the stress on social service destroyed the ideals of the church; therefore, it desired to abandon the extreme emphasis on the institutional church. The majority, however, held to the program of social Christianity but demanded that its several phases be co-ordinated more closely. The author concludes that, successful as the beginning had been, the urban religious problem had not been solved within the period which he studied. "A more extensive social service, a keener sense of responsibility for the removal of industrial evils and, above all, a profoundly spiritual use of the agencies of social Christianity—these must be the keys to religious success in the coming century" (p. 255). Now that nearly half of this century has passed, the author's estimate of its socio-religious achievements would be welcomed in a second study.

So thoroughly does Mr. Abell strive to cover the field under investigation that his book becomes slightly repetitious and verbose. Since there are few references to the area west of the Mississippi and south of the Ohio, the reviewer feels that

the title of the book is too inclusive. Undoubtedly libraries in regions other than those mentioned by the author possess material that would have enlarged and further enriched this study of the Protestant Church in America.

Agnes Scott College

WALTER B. POSEY

Henry W. Grady: Spokesman of the New South. By Raymond B. Nixon. (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1943. Pp. xii, 360, xiv. Illustrations, bibliography, appendix. \$4.00.)

There is nothing like the traffic in historical symbols to take the edge and true character out of the image of a historical personage. Henry W. Grady has been especially susceptible in that respect. Rarely in our history has one name been made to do such heavy duty in symbolizing an epoch as that of Grady; yet until now there has been no biography of the man other than the memorials published shortly after his death. Mr. Nixon's book would be important if for no other reason than that it is the first biography by a trained scholar. In addition, however, the author has recoined a custom-worn symbol into a clear-cut, life-like image of a man. Mr. Nixon enjoyed the advantage of being the first to have access to the Grady Collection at Emory University, and he has improved his opportunity by using also the Felton, Gordon, Harris, Northen, and Stephens collections, among others. His work bears the mark of scholarly industry, skill, and resourcefulness in digging out and using his materials.

Grady the orator, the industrial propagandist, and the political strategist are subordinated to Grady the journalist in Mr. Nixon's portrait. His pictures of the reporter in action—chartering special trains to cover an earthquake; scooping the national press in 1876 and 1878; outwitting the country's best feature writers; outselling, outadvertising, and outwriting his rival editors—are among the most vivid in the book. "A good reporter who subsides into an able editor marks a loss to journalism," remarked Grady. He had the reporter's itch to be "in the thick of affairs" plus the orator's urge to take charge. Whether it was a baseball league to be launched and a John L. Sullivan to be sponsored, or a pair of senators to be elected and a couple of estranged sections to be "reconciled," Grady was on hand with appropriate remarks and with a news story burning the wires. To every occasion he lent his gospel of optimism: "sunshine everywhere and all the time."

Mr. Nixon is perfectly aware that Grady's significance does not rest upon his accomplishments as a journalist. He agrees that Grady's name is "inseparable" from that of the New South movement, and recognizes him as "the symbol of the New South." He believes that in that role Grady stood for "a broad progressive program" which embraced the interests of all classes and races, that he "combined an attitude of liberalism with an enlightened and entirely practical ap-

proach to the difficult race problem," and that in general he provided a "liberal and constructive" leadership. Especially does Mr. Nixon deplore a tendency in some writers to fix upon Grady as "a scapegoat for the South's present ills."

In arriving at any satisfactory historical estimate of a figure as inseparably associated with a movement as Grady was with the New South movement, it is difficult to see how one can fairly dissociate the prophet from the apostles he chose, or from the values he professed and his followers realized. If Grady was, as Mr. Nixon not inaccurately calls him, the "Warwick of Georgia Politics" in the 1880's, he should share the name earned by the men he elevated to power—the "Bourbon Triumvirate," for instance, consisting of Brown, Gordon, and Colquitt. History has dealt much more severely with their regime than with the "Warwick" back of it. The uses which the triumvirate (two of whom were convict lessees) made of the race issue in their political campaigns can hardly be described as "liberal" or "enlightened." Not untypical of the business leadership of the New South were Major E. A. Burke and John H. Inman. Both men were close associates and friends of Grady, who held up Inman as a model for the youth of the South. The sordid details of the business career and methods of either man would amply illustrate the origin of several assorted ills of the present South. It was Inman who sponsored Grady's historic appearance before the New England Society in 1886. Other guests of honor included J. Pierpont Morgan, Lyman Abbott, Russell Sage, and Henry M. Flagler, who presumably joined in the "three cheers and a tiger" for the New South.

Mr. Nixon is quite just in calling to account those who have "painted Grady as a 'front' for predatory economic interests." Grady was too thoroughly and sincerely identified with the doctrine he preached to be called a "front" for any interest. His ancestry on neither side of the house was identified with the old planter class. They were ante-bellum traders, promoters, speculators, gold prospectors. His wife's family was among the builders of the first cotton factory in Athens, and Grady, who narrowly missed a career as a gas plant operator in Rome, could never resist the lure of the stock market. Cyrus W. Field of Wall Street loaned Grady the \$20,000 with which he bought his interest in the *Atlanta Constitution*, and as part of the arrangement Victor Newcomb, of the Louisville and Nashville Railroad, guided him in "handling a sizeable block of L. & N. stock on margin," to pay off the debt.

One of the sections of Professor Vernon L. Parrington's *Main Currents* that he did not live to complete was called "The Hesitant South," under which he placed a chapter to be called "Henry W. Grady and the Surrender to the Middle Class." If Mr. Nixon did not fill in that missing chapter with his biography, he has provided ample materials for the writing of it.

Navy Department, Washington, D. C.

C. VANN WOODWARD

George W. Littlefield, Texan. By J. Evetts Haley. (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1943. Pp. xiv, 288. Illustrations. \$3.00.)

Anyone who has reveled in the richness of the Littlefield Collection of the University of Texas will be grateful to Mr. Haley for preserving the personality and achievements of this great benefactor of southern history. In spite of the dimness of the trail at intervals, the outstanding interests and traits of character of this dominant master of the range and counting house have been clearly presented. These, as the reviewer understands them, were: devotion to the South and all who suffered in its defense; acquisition of wealth; paternalistic attitude toward his numerous kinsmen and close friends; good judgment, balanced between caution and conservatism on the one hand, and foresight and daring on the other; leadership—ability to dominate the thinking and actions of his associates, and to command the undeviating loyalty of those who served him; support of the University of Texas.

Littlefield's immediate ancestral background and his Civil War experiences are covered briefly but satisfactorily. He came from energetic and capable stock. His mother, "Ole Mistis," was a remarkable woman. His Civil War activities were somewhat circumscribed, but commendable. To be chosen Captain by his own soldiers before he was twenty-one, and to be raised to Major for gallantry while he lay wounded on the battlefield, tells the story better than reams of detail. Nath, faithful slave attendant throughout the War, nursed him back to health, and returned with him to Texas. This faithful Negro servant remained with the Major throughout life; outliving him, was cared for by will; and, at long last, he was laid to rest by the Major's side.

For a short while after returning to Texas, Littlefield farmed, but his compelling urge for wealth soon turned his boundless energies to the trail, first with horses and then cattle. He early pointed his herds north—to Kansas City, Abilene, Dodge City, and points farther north and west. Originally, his aim was to drive cattle up the trails to market, but he soon decided to range them on the short grass and grama of the high plains. His first location was on the South Canadian near Old Tascosa. He was successful in building up a great organization, and lucky in capitalizing upon the cattle boom in the form of Scotch Syndicate investments that reached him in the early 1880's. He sold out—12,000 cattle, and the LIT brand, and range rights—for \$253,000. The author's explanation of range rights is interesting. "Littlefield did not own it, . . . but until crowding settlement and plastered landscript gave it value and tied it down in fee, it was his to use or sell, in keeping with the honest and generous code of the open range." The next location was the LFD range on the Pecos north of Roswell, New Mexico, and before this area became crowded he moved to the Four Lakes on the high plains of Texas. By this time Littlefield had come to sit

in his "saffron cage" in the American National Bank, Austin, Texas, and from this vantage point to direct his manifold cattle and banking interests.

Littlefield's activities in politics are depicted, and one notes the comparison of the machine controlled and subsidized votes of the cities with the practical methods of the Major—how he paid off his Negro voters at the polls after getting the "high sign" from some official that they had voted right. His relations with Governor Ferguson, especially during the Ferguson-University fight, were not very commendable. The last will and testament, in addition to its careful provisions for kinsmen and friends, gave crowning evidence of his desire to provide for the ambitions of the University of Texas to become the center of Southern education and culture.

This is the third book written by this remarkably gifted writer. It is a splendid volume, interesting and valuable; but in comparison with his biography of Charles Goodnight, there is a feeling of incompleteness, or, as the author expresses it, the "trail grows dim." The author's personality and philosophy are cleverly woven into this book. By no means the least interesting feature of the book is the series of pen sketches of cowboys and contemporary characters, drawn by Harold D. Bugbee.

College of Mines, El Paso, Texas

J. L. WALLER

Charles J. Bonaparte, Patrician Reformer: His Earlier Career. By Eric F. Goldman. *The Johns Hopkins University Studies in Historical and Political Science*, Series LXI, No. 2. (Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins Press, 1943. Pp. 150. Bibliography, appendix. \$1.50.)

Charles J. Bonaparte, the grandson of the great Napoleon's brother and the dazzling Betsy Patterson of Baltimore, was an American by birth, a patrician in outlook, and a reformer in action. Made financially independent by inheritance and socially secure by name and wealth, he viewed mankind with unusual detachment. Bonaparte was proud of his position as an American citizen. Unlike other members of his family, he made no attempt to form a marriage connection with foreign nobility or to acquire French citizenship, but he had some interesting ideas concerning people in a democracy. "An aristocrat to the last detail," he possessed an "inherent hatred of the vulgar and the greedy rich"—those who considered wealth the only real measure of success. He defended, with slight qualifications, the "much mis-judged custom of lynching." Although he supported local charitable societies, the attitude and work of people like Jane Addams he considered "sentimentalism" or "spurious philanthropy." Special provision should be made for the education of the indigent, but others should pay tuition in the public schools. "There is absolutely no difference in principle between a public soup-house and a public free-school"—a remark which caused some to call him "Soup-house Charlie." He doubted whether even in America

"individual liberty, as we know it, can permanently co-exist with popular government." "A self-governing nation of all others, needs the Catholic Church" to save it from "an intolerant atheism and an arrogant materialism" which he believed was associated with the dangerous and "arbitrary dogma that all men are precisely equal."

Bonaparte's ideal of government was that it should be in the hands of "an enlightened and disinterested elite," a choice group, "who," says Dr. Goldman, "had neither the leveling tendency of the poor nor the money-mindedness of the newly rich, in short, of men like Bonaparte." Believing that such a government could best be secured by civil service reform, Bonaparte, a "moralist favoring an aristocracy for the good of the democracy," spent much of his time and money supporting the National Civil Service Reform League and similar organizations of a local nature.

Bonaparte was a close friend of another patrician reformer, Theodore Roosevelt, to whom he owed appointment to nearly all of his public offices. As a member of the Board of Indian Commissioners he revealed his high idealism and his great ability as a shrewd lawyer in the interests of the Indians and of the Catholic Church. As special assistant to the Attorney General in an investigation of alleged frauds in the Post Office Department, he showed that the "conspicuous morality of patrician reformers had its uses." After serving as special inspector of conditions in the Indian Territory, he wrote a sane and judicious report recommending needed changes in the management of the Territory. His fearless work in these investigations gave him the nickname of "Charlie the Crook Chaser" and brought him prominently to the public's attention.

In May, 1905, Bonaparte was appointed "Stop-Gap Secretary of the Navy" with the understanding that he was to serve until Attorney General Moody's retirement from the cabinet. He knew that Roosevelt intended to have him succeed Moody as Attorney General. Bonaparte admitted that he knew nothing about naval affairs; in fact he had never been on a ship of any kind. He was one of six naval secretaries during Roosevelt's tenure of office. In this position he revealed his administrative ability, but he had little time or opportunity to work out a program. In August, 1906, the patrician reformer was made Attorney General, but this study ends with that appointment, except for an "Epilogue" of two pages to show the outlines of his career until his death in 1921.

Dr. Goldman's dissertation is a painstaking account which meets the highest standards of historical research. The author writes well, but much of the subject matter of Chapters II, III, and IV is deadly to the reader. The first and last chapters are more important and more interesting. Dr. Goldman's expected induction into the military service caused the Johns Hopkins History Department to urge the publication of the dissertation substantially as it was submitted in June, 1938, but it is unfortunate that in its published form there is no account of Bonaparte's

work as Attorney General, in which he made a reputation as a "trustbuster." Also interesting would be his fight as a Progressive in the election of 1912, his insistence on greater preparedness preceding America's entrance into war in 1917, and his opposition to the League of Nations.

Washington and Lee University

ALLEN W. MOGER

The St. Johns: A Parade of Diversities. By Branch Cabell and A. J. Hanna. (New York: Farrar and Rinehart, 1943. Pp. xii, 324. Illustrations, bibliography. \$2.50.)

This is the twenty-fourth of the *Rivers of America* series, and the first collaborative work in that series. Professor A. J. Hanna, historian, and James Branch Cabell, novelist, have combined efforts to produce this fascinating volume. In many respects they have departed from the usual trend of the other river books. This has been due to the fact that a strong-willed historian has been diligent at the task of keeping a strong-willed novelist down to earth. The results are interesting for the reader. Throughout the text there are Cabellian flights, with Hanna dragging him back to earth again. As one might expect, the influence of Cabell is to be noted in emphasis upon certain dominating human instincts and impulses, and in certain neatly turned phrases. Hanna, a competent writer in his own stead, has supplied the meat of the text, and has kept this writing venture confined to the river.

Every southern school boy of two or three decades ago was told that the St. Johns River was an important stream because it flowed north. The unimaginative teachers never knew that it also flowed north in its history. The authors have traced the development of the country along the river through highly personalized accounts of the people who attempted to make its valley their home. The St. Johns' history has been a kaleidoscopic one of Spaniards, Frenchmen, Indians, Englishmen and, later, American speculators. It has been disturbed by both international and domestic strife. When nations were not disputing its possession then it was in the hands of private brigands who were, if possible, less human in their assertion of rights of exploitation.

Gentler autocrats than the bloody French and Spanish conquistadors came to the St. Johns. There was Mrs. Calvin Ellis Stowe, who came ostensibly to save her drunken son, Captain Frederick Stowe, from an early grave, but remained to save the St. Johns' Valley from the devil according to the Stowe concept of the High Church Episcopal faith. At Mandarin the "little woman" gave her reading public the pleasure of seeing her in the throes of spreading sweetness and light in the *Christian Union*, and of involving the *Atlantic Monthly* in her famous Byronian travesty and Florida in an overwhelming tourist trade. The authors turned loose with all they had in this chapter. They were two Southerners stalking their prey with complete and perfect abandon.

At the end the authors had misgivings. They added an "epilogue in the form of an altercation," which throws much light upon the relationship of a historian and a novelist in the writing of history. This epilogue is within itself an estimate of the material and point of view which went into the book.

Certainly these authors have proved that the St. Johns has played a far more important role in American history than the mere fact that it flows north. This is a good contribution to the *Rivers of America* series.

University of Kentucky

THOMAS D. CLARK

Historical News and Notices

The following committee assignments for 1944 have been announced by Wendell H. Stephenson, the president of the Association. *Committee on Nominations*: Ross H. McLean, Emory University, chairman; F. Garvin Davenport, Transylvania College; Alfred J. Hanna, Rollins College; Maude H. Woodfin, University of Richmond; Robert H. Woody, Duke University. *Committee on Program*: Fletcher M. Green, University of North Carolina, chairman; John F. Ramsey, University of Alabama, chairman of sub-committee on European history; Alfred W. Reynolds, Alabama Polytechnic Institute; Joseph C. Robert, Duke University; Daniel M. Robison, Vanderbilt University; T. Harry Williams, Louisiana State University. *Committee on Membership*: Thomas D. Clark, University of Kentucky, chairman, with the other members of the committee to be announced later.

PERSONAL

Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., is offering two fellowships of \$2,500 each, designed to stimulate the production of books in American history and biography which will be reliable in their content, appealing in their literary style, and rich in their interpretation of American life. One of the fellowships will be in the field of biography and the other in the field of history. They are in no sense prizes for completed manuscripts, but are for the purpose of assisting in the task of research that underlies sound work. Application blanks may be obtained from Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 501 Madison Avenue, New York 22, New York, and completed applications must be received not later than June 1, 1944.

The Archivist of the United States has announced the appointment of Dan Lacy, formerly Assistant to the Archivist, as Director of Operations in the National Archives. Philip C. Brooks, formerly Assistant Director of Records Accessioning and Preservation, has been made Assistant Director of Operations. Thad Page, Administrative Secretary, will serve also as Chief of the Division of Legislative Archives, and Elizabeth E. Hamer, formerly Acting Chief of the Division of Information and Publications, has been named Assistant Administrative Secretary. Gerald J. Davis, a member of the National Archives staff for six years, has been appointed Chief of the Division of Justice Department Archives. Members of the staff who have recently been transferred to do records administration or research work in other government agencies include Forrest L. Foor,

Elbert L. Ruber, Gibbs Myers, Marie O. Stark, and Harvey J. Winter. Among members of the staff who have recently entered the armed services are Kenneth W. Munden, Allen M. Ross, and Jerome Thomases. Edward G. Campbell and Robert Claus have returned to the National Archives after receiving honorable discharges from the Army.

Pierce Cline, president of Centenary College of Shreveport, Louisiana, since 1933, died suddenly on October 25 at the age of fifty-three. A native of Georgia, he received the A.B. and M.A. degrees from Emory University, and continued his graduate study at the University of Chicago and Columbia University. He had served as instructor in history at Emory University and at Birmingham-Southern College before going to Centenary College as professor of history in 1920.

Miss Nina M. Visscher, who has served since 1923 as the librarian of the Kentucky State Historical Society, died on December 11, 1943.

HISTORICAL SOCIETIES

At the November meeting of the Louisiana Historical Society, H. Mortimer Favrot presented a paper entitled "Don Pedro Favrot; a Correction." The December meeting of the Society commemorated the one hundred and fortieth anniversary of the Louisiana Purchase with a paper by Isaac Joslin Cox on "Trailways to the Momentous Transfer."

The program of the October meeting of the Tennessee Historical Society consisted of a paper on "Ezekiel Birdseye and the State of Frankland," by Henry Lee Swint, Vanderbilt University. At the November meeting Joseph M. Batten, Scarritt College, presented a paper on "The Rise of Methodism in Tennessee," and in December, J. R. Whitaker, George Peabody College for Teachers, discussed "Geographic Factors in Tennessee History."

At the annual business session, held in connection with the December meeting, the following officers were elected for the year 1944: Stanley F. Horn, Nashville, president; Samuel C. Williams, Johnson City, R. B. C. Howell, Nashville, Walter Chandler, Memphis, and Mrs. Rhea Garrett, Dixon Springs, vice-presidents; Robert T. Quarles, Jr., Nashville, recording secretary; Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, Tennessee State Library, corresponding secretary; and Mrs. John H. DeWitt, Nashville, treasurer.

The North Carolina State Literary and Historical Association held its forty-third annual meeting on December 2 at Raleigh. The program included a paper by Mrs. Inglis Fletcher on "The Function of the Historical Novel"; one by Miss Charlie Huss on "Preserving Our War Records"; one by Virginius Dabney on

"Race: the South's Problem Number I"; and the presidential address, by Paul Green, on "North Carolina Progress." The following officers were elected for the year 1944: Hubert M. Poteat, Wake Forest College, president; Frontis Johnston, Davidson College, Mrs. Inglis Fletcher, Wilmington, and Charles Lee Smith, Raleigh, vice-presidents; and Christopher Crittenden of the State Department of Archives and History, secretary-treasurer.

The North Carolina Folk-Lore Society, the North Carolina State Art Society, the North Carolina Archeological Society, and the North Carolina Society for the Preservation of Antiquities, also held their annual sessions concurrently with the meeting of the Literary and Historical Association.

At the November meeting of the Columbia Historical Society, of Washington, D. C., Mrs. Walter G. Peter presented a paper based on the unpublished letters written by Dolly Madison to Anthony Morris in the 1830's relative to the Nourse family of the Highlands, Maryland. These letters, which were recently discovered in an old trunk, throw additional light on Mrs. Madison's activities during the period.

The Society has elected the following officers for 1944: F. Regis Noel, president; Wade H. Ellis and Charles Carroll Glover, Jr., vice-presidents; Newman F. McGirr, recording secretary and curator; Mrs. McConey Werlich, corresponding secretary; John C. Proctor, chronicler; Victor B. Deber, treasurer; Charles O. Paullin, editor; and Henry P. Blair, Wade H. Cooper, Charles E. Phillips, and Laurence F. Schmeckebier, members of the board of managers.

The East Tennessee Historical Society has elected the following officers for the year 1944: J. Wesley Hoffmann, University of Tennessee, president; Helen M. Harris, Lawson McGhee Library, Adelaide Rowell, Chattanooga, and Samuel C. Williams, Johnson City, vice-presidents; Martha L. Ellison, Lawson McGhee Library, secretary; Laura E. Luttrell, Lawson McGhee Library, treasurer; Samuel O. Houston, Knoxville, and Arda Walker, Maryville, members of the executive committee; and Stanley J. Folmsbee, University of Tennessee, editor of the Society's *Publications*.

The program of the November meeting of the Society consisted of a paper on "The History of Cultural Islands in Tennessee," by Walter M. Kollmorgen, research director of the Tennessee State Planning Commission.

The Mississippi Department of Archives and History has recently published its *Biennial Report* for the period from July 1, 1941, through June 30, 1943, in which is presented a detailed account of the activities of its staff, the acquisition of manuscripts and other source materials, publications issued under its sponsorship, and a statement of its program for the future.

The Maryland Historical Society announces the acquisition during recent months of many valuable manuscript collections, important among them being

the Howard papers of about 1700 items, and a supplementary group of Ridgely papers to complete the holdings already on hand in that collection. The Howard papers cover periods of Maryland history from about 1750 to 1920. Among the outstanding items are letters from the Rev. Alexander Williamson of Frederick County to Dr. Upton Scott of Annapolis (1761-1769); letters from French refugees to Dr. Scott (1794-1802); correspondence between Francis Scott Key and John Randolph of Roanoke (1811-1826); letters from Roger B. Taney to members of his family (1819-1864); papers of Captain John Eager Howard while serving in the army during the Mexican War; and letters to and from members of the Howard family while prisoners during the Civil War.

Other materials received include nine account books of Thomas Irwin of Alexandria, Virginia (1827-1831); the letter book and account book of Thomas Irwin, Jr. (1824-1857); a series of letters to and from William B. and Henry M. Graves while they were in the Army of Northern Virginia (1862-1865); twenty volumes of record books of the Confederate Soldiers' Home at Pikesville, Maryland, which trace in detail the history of that institution to the time of its closing in 1932; papers of the Rev. Charles W. Baldwin, including material on Mountain Lake Park and Chautauqua (1886-1904), and on Anne Arundel Academy at Millersville (1917-1918); a collection of Baltimore theater and concert programs (1892-1919); forty-five volumes and twenty-five packages of papers of the Baltimore firm of Smith and Atkinson (1839-1891); thirty-three volumes of the account books of the firm of George R. Riggs and Company, also of Baltimore (1817-1842); the Civil War diary of James J. Williamson (1863-1865); a miscellaneous group of papers, memoranda, and correspondence of Judge Carroll T. Bond; and a complete file of the *Washington Museum* for the years 1800-1801.

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL

Announcement has recently been made of the completion of plans for the editing and publishing of a comprehensive edition of the works of Thomas Jefferson under the joint sponsorship of Princeton University and the *New York Times*. It is expected that the completion of the task will require about fifteen years and that the resulting edition of Jefferson's works will approximate fifty volumes. Julian P. Boyd, librarian of Princeton University and historian to the Thomas Jefferson Bicentennial Commission, is to serve as editor in charge of the undertaking. He is being assisted by an advisory committee of which Douglas S. Freeman of Richmond, Virginia, is chairman. Other members of this committee are: Mrs. Arthur H. Sulzberger, of New York City; Randolph G. Adams, of the William L. Clements Library of the University of Michigan; Solon J. Buck, Archivist of the United States; Fiske Kimball, of the Philadelphia Art Museum; Archibald MacLeish, Librarian of Congress; Dumas Malone, of Charlottesville, Virginia; Bernard Mayo, University of Virginia; Samuel E. Morison, Harvard University; Carl Van Doren, New York City; Lawrence C. Wroth, Brown Uni-

versity; and President Harold W. Dodds, George A. Brakeley, Charles Scribner, and Datus C. Smith, Jr., of Princeton University.

According to a recent announcement made jointly by President John E. Pomfret of William and Mary College and President Kenneth Chorley of Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated, the two institutions are pooling their historical resources in a broad program of research and publication with special emphasis on the study of Colonial American history. This co-operation will be carried out through the creation of an Institute of Early American History and Culture, which will assume responsibility for the conducting of historical studies in the broad field of Colonial American history; the assuming of direction of a number of grants-in-aid for the promotion of research projects; the development of a collection of early Americana in all forms; and the sponsoring of the *William and Mary Quarterly* as a medium for the publication of many of its special studies.

The Institute will be administered under the direction of an Advisory Board which is being created by a merger of the advisory committee of historians of Colonial Williamsburg and the editorial board of the *William and Mary Quarterly*. The membership of this Board will include: Samuel E. Morison and Arthur M. Schlesinger, of Harvard University; Thomas J. Wertenbaker and Julian P. Boyd, of Princeton University; Hunter D. Farish, Colonial Williamsburg, Incorporated; Virginius Dabney, Richmond, Virginia; Leonard W. Labaree, Yale University; Thomas P. Abernethy, University of Virginia; Curtis P. Nettels, University of Wisconsin; Stanley M. Pargellis, Newberry Library, Chicago; Randolph G. Adams, Clements Library of the University of Michigan; Louis B. Wright, of Huntington Library; and John E. Pomfret, Richard L. Morton, and Earl G. Swem, of William and Mary College.

A large collection of books, pamphlets, manuscripts, maps, serials, and newspapers dealing especially with the economic and social history of the South is being acquired by the library of the University of California at Los Angeles. The collection includes about 2400 manuscript items, among which are papers of William Blount, early Virginia papers, material on Georgia in the American Revolution, and other eighteenth century documents. The printed materials include collections on the presidential campaign of 1856, on Reconstruction, and on Andrew Jackson, Edgar Allan Poe, and other well-known southern figures.

The Huntington Library has received a grant of \$50,000 from the Rockefeller Foundation to be expended in support of the development of its program for regional studies of the Southwest. The project will be carried on under the supervision of Robert Glass Cleland, formerly of Occidental College and now a member of the Library's research staff. The program provides for a comprehensive study of the economic, cultural, and social development of the general region

embracing Arizona, Nevada, New Mexico, Utah, and Southern California, with special attention to the impact of three frontier cultures—Indian, Hispanic, and Anglo-American. The work will include the collection of manuscripts, newspapers, and other source materials relating to the region, and an important part of the program will be the continuation of the conferences and seminars at the Library, in which scholars from other parts of the country as well as from local institutions participate. A limited number of fellowships and grants-in-aid will be made available.

Recent accessions of the National Archives have greatly added to its already large collection of still photographs. Exclusive of duplicates, there are now more than 800,000 glass-plate and film negatives, tin types, stereoscopic views, color transparencies, paper prints, radiophotos, microfilm, and other types of photographs in the National Archives. The largest group relates to military affairs. Transfers from the Signal Corps and the Historical Section of the Army War College have concentrated in the National Archives the major pictorial records of the wars in which the United States has been engaged from the beginning of the Civil War through World War I. Among the earliest items are the Civil War pictures made by Mathew B. Brady and T. H. O'Sullivan and the latter's photographs of the Darien expedition of 1872. Also significant historically and photographically are the International Boundary Commission pictures, 1892-1894, of border towns, mines, and missions, the late nineteenth century hand-colored lantern slides of T. H. McAllister, and the Jackson photographs of Yellowstone Park and the Far West.

Another large group of special records in the National Archives—maps and charts—has also been increased by recent transfers. Among the materials received are the maps, many of them of strategic areas, compiled by the Cartographic Study, a New York City WPA project, Army Map Service maps, 1870-1942, of various countries and areas, chiefly European; Naval Intelligence maps, 1875-1935, of countries throughout the world, with some emphasis on Mexico, other parts of Latin America, and the Far East; and the entire body of manuscript maps, 1855-1936, of the Hydrographic Office, Navy Department, that embody the results of sounding and other hydrographic surveys in foreign waters.

Other accessions of note are certain scientifically interesting files of the Hydrographic Office, including records of naval expeditions, 1811-1939, and surveyors' field notebooks and "boat" and "smooth" sheets, 1855-1939, from which printed charts are derived; War Department records such as the general court-martial records of 1917-1920, records of various military departments and posts, 1857-1910, and Confederate and Union Army records; anti-trust files of the Department of Justice, 1920-1933; and records of the United States Antarctic Service, 1939-1942.

Among the recent additions to the collection of manuscripts relating to naval history in the Franklin D. Roosevelt Library were a number of logs and journals

of such United States naval vessels as the *Essex*, the *John Adams*, the *Enterprise*, the *Constitution*, the *Shark*, the *Missouri*, and the *Brooklyn*, mainly for the period 1800 to 1821, but some for as late as 1888; a letter book and journal of Captain Matthew C. Perry relating to the improvement of the Port of New York, April 14-July 29, 1837; and the "General Letters," October 25-December 2, 1863, of Rear Admiral David D. Porter as commanding officer of the Mississippi Squadron. The logs and journals received are not official records but are the "rough logs" or drafts kept by the ships' officers and traditionally retained by them as their personal property.

Inter American Intellectual Interchange, published by the Institute of Latin American Studies of the University of Texas (Austin, 1943, pp. ix, 188), consists of fourteen papers which were presented at the third annual conference in the field of Latin American studies, held at Austin in the summer of 1943. The papers are grouped under the following broad topics: the development of intellectual interchange; philosophy, literature, and science; need for cultural understanding; history; the fine arts. Of special interest to the historian are the papers by Carlos E. Castañeda on "The Broadening Concept of History Teaching in Texas" (pp. 97-108), Arturo Arnaiz y Freg on "Influence of Cultural Interchange on the Teaching of History of Mexico" (pp. 109-20), and Arthur P. Whitaker on "Cultural Interchange and the Teaching of History in the United States" (pp. 121-34).

The third number of the Emory University *Sources and Reprints* is entitled "Autobiography of 'The Countrymen,' 1866," edited by Thomas H. English (Atlanta: Emory University Library, 1943, pp. 20). This is an autobiographical sketch of the life and activities of Joseph Addison Turner (1826-1868), who strove for recognition as a literary figure in ante-bellum Georgia and who is perhaps best remembered as the publisher of *The Countryman* during the Civil War and as the inspirer of Joel Chandler Harris.

The latest publication in the Agricultural History Series is *Jefferson and Agriculture* (Washington, 1943, pp. iv, 92), a source-book compiled and edited by Everett E. Edwards of the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture. Part I, entitled "Jefferson's Contributions," consists of an article on "Thomas Jefferson; Farmer, Educator, and Democrat," by Henry A. Wallace, and one on "Thomas Jefferson—Farmer," by M. L. Wilson. Part II is made up of selections from Jefferson's writings, including his views on the nature of the national economy, his observations on agriculture in Europe and the United States, and his comments on his farming activities and on the advancement of agriculture.

Historical Atlas of the United States (New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1944, pp. xviii, 253), by Clifford L. Lord and Elizabeth H. Lord, presents 312

maps and nineteen pages of statistical data with emphasis on social and economic developments in the United States, "designed to help every student of American history along the road to that clarified, broader, integrated understanding which is the essence of intelligent education" (p. v).

The Bayous of Louisiana (New York: William Morrow and Company, 1943, pp. viii, 341), by Harnett T. Kane, is a skillful blending of tradition, history, and personal observation to produce an entertaining account of life in a region completely unlike any other part of the United States. A map, excellent illustrations, and a seven-page bibliography increase its value for both the general reader and the serious student.

The Letters of Don Juan McQueen to His Family, Written from Spanish East Florida, 1791-1807 (Columbia, S. C.: published for the Georgia Society of the Colonial Dames of America, by Bostick and Thornley, 1943, pp. xxxiv, 89), edited with a biographical sketch by Walter Charlton Hartridge, presents a collection of hitherto unknown letters from an officer in the American Revolutionary Army who later became a loyal Spanish subject in Florida. As Professor A. J. Hanna points out in his introduction to the collection, the information contained in these letters is fragmentary, but they are significant "in that they shed light on that comparatively unexplored thirty-eight year period of Florida history preceding 1821. They help also to piece together the facts in another field in which little has yet been done, that of Georgia-Florida relations." In describing his activities as a cotton planter, lumber baron, mill owner, and commander of the militia of the St. Johns and St. Marys rivers, McQueen perhaps unconsciously threw much light on economic and social conditions in Spanish Florida. It is to be hoped that the publication of these letters will lead to the discovery of other material which will make possible the completion of a more extended study of both McQueen and Spanish Florida.

David Dale Owen: Pioneer Geologist of the Middle West (Indianapolis: Indiana Historical Bureau, 1943, pp. xiv, 180), by Walter Brookfield Hendrickson, published as Volume XXVII of the *Indiana Historical Collections*, rescues from an undeserved obscurity a man whose scientific work of a century ago was well and favorably known to his contemporaries. Through his work on pioneering surveys of three states and three territories, Owen gave the world the first connected picture of the rock structure and the mineral wealth of the upper Mississippi Valley and laid the groundwork for later geological investigation. Mr. Hendrickson has made good use of widely scattered manuscript materials and of public documents and has made an important contribution toward a better understanding of the interrelations of scientific enterprise and historical developments in the past. An excellent index and a twenty-page bibliography add much to the value of the work for other scholars.

Race and Rumors of Race: Challenge to American Crisis (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1943, pp. x, 245), by Howard W. Odum, represents an attempt by an outstanding southern sociologist to set down observations and recordings of what happened in connection with increasing reports of race tension during the twelve-months period from July to July, 1942-1943. After discussing briefly the factors which contributed toward such tension, Mr. Odum devotes the greater part of his study to an examination of the more persistent rumors in an effort to determine their origin and to test their validity. Although not always successful in accomplishing both aims, the study points the way toward a rational rather than emotional handling of the problem. The book unquestionably deserves an important place in the literature of race relations in the United States.

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "Captain Robert Morris of Ratcliffe Manor," by Louis Dow Scisco, in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (December).
- "Bennet Allen, Fighting Parson," by Josephine Fisher, *ibid.*
- "Magic in Early Baltimore," by Milbourne Christopher, *ibid.*
- "The Baltimore Germans and the Year 1848," by Dieter Cunz, in the *American-German Review* (October).
- "In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace," by Fiske Kimball, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (October).
- "Harrisons in Virginia during the Reign of James I," by Francis Burton Harrison, *ibid.*
- "English Education of Thomas Nelson, Jr., of Yorktown," by G. MacLaren Brydon, *ibid.*
- "Archibald Woods of Albemarle County," by Katie-Prince Ward, *ibid.*
- "The Ethnological Significance of Tindall's Map of Virginia, 1608," by Maurice A. Mook, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (October).
- "George Mason, Westerner," by Kenneth P. Bailey, *ibid.*
- "The Colonial Churches of King and Queen and King William Counties, Virginia," by George Carrington Mason, *ibid.*
- "The Fish and Fisheries of Colonial Virginia," continued, by John C. Pearson, *ibid.*
- "Daniel Bryan, Poet," by Elizabeth Binns, *ibid.*
- "Which Hugh Jones?" by Grace Warren Landrum, *ibid.*
- "The Port Towns of the Pamunkey," by Malcolm H. Harris, *ibid.*
- "Legal Holidays Peculiar to Colonial Virginia," by Charles Edgar Gilliam, *ibid.*
- "Public Buildings in Craven County, 1722-1835," by Alonzo Thomas Dill, Jr., in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).

- "Congressional Action on the Admission of Tennessee into the Union," by Charlotte Williams, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "A Saga of the Western Waters," by William E. Beard, *ibid.*
- "Boone Station Site," by C. Frank Dunn, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "Aaron Burr's 'Trial' for Treason at Frankfort, Kentucky, 1806," by Willard Rouse Jillson, in the *Filson Club History Quarterly* (October).
- "Missouri, Crossroads of the Nation," by Wiley B. Rutledge, in the *Missouri Historical Review* (October).
- "Traces in Early Missouri, 1700-1804," by Martha May Wood, *ibid.*
- "A Snapshot of Alexander W. Doniphan, 1808-1887," by Frederic A. Culmer, *ibid.*
- "The Old St. Jo Gazette," by Frederic M. Pumphrey, *ibid.*
- "History of Cattle Ranching in Eastern Oklahoma," by Norman Arthur Graebner, in the *Chronicles of Oklahoma* (September).
- "From Brush Arbor to Boston Avenue—First Methodist Episcopal Church, South, Tulsa," by Fred S. Clinton, *ibid.*
- "A Creek Pioneer, Notes Concerning 'Aunt Sue' Rogers and Her Family," by Carolyn Thomas Foreman, *ibid.*
- "Wildlife on the T-5 and Spade Ranches," by Ralph H. Records, *ibid.*
- "The Lost Captain—J. L. Dawson of Old Fort Gibson," by James Henry Gardner, *ibid.*
- "Oklahoma and Indian Territory as Embraced Within the Territory of Louisiana," by Robert L. Williams, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE UPPER SOUTH

- "The Calvert-Stier Correspondence," concluded, edited by William D. Hoyt, Jr., in the *Maryland Historical Magazine* (December).
- "Letters of the Haynie Family," edited by Doris Maslin Cohn, *ibid.*
- "Letters of Charles Carroll, Barrister," concluded, *ibid.*
- "Auditor Stegge's Accounts," continued, edited by Maude H. Woodfin, in the *Virginia Magazine of History and Biography* (October).
- "Copies of Extant Wills from Counties Whose Records Have Been Destroyed," continued, edited by George H. S. King, in *Tyler's Quarterly Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "Matthew Fontaine Maury's Holy Bible," *ibid.*
- "Extract from a Letter by Pastor Storch in North Carolina, Dated Salisbury, January 20-February 25, 1796," edited by Joseph Stewart, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).
- "Reconstruction Letters from North Carolina, Part IX, Letters to Benjamin Franklin Butler," continued, edited by James A. Padgett, *ibid.*

- "Writings on Tennessee Counties," continued, compiled by Laura E. Luttrell and Pollyanna Creekmore, in the *Tennessee Historical Quarterly* (December).
- "Record of Commissions of Officers in the Tennessee Militia, 1807, 1808," continued, compiled by Mrs. John Trotwood Moore, *ibid.*
- "Letters of General Samuel Hopkins of Henderson, Kentucky," contributed by Alice C. McDaniel, in the *Register of the Kentucky State Historical Society* (October).
- "Memoir of Lexington and Its Vicinity," by William Leavy, continued, edited by Nina M. Visscher, *ibid.*

ARTICLES ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "The Fireproof Building: New Home of the South Carolina Historical Society," by Helen G. McCormack in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "General Gaines Meets Governor Troup: A State-Federal Clash in 1825," by James W. Silver, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Forgotten Scientists in Georgia and South Carolina," by Richard Beale Davis, *ibid.*
- "Alleged Spanish Grants in British West Florida," by Clinton N. Howard, in the *Florida Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Privateering in Florida Waters and Northwards in the Revolution," by Wilbur H. Siebert, *ibid.*
- "Pioneer Florida: Indian Key and Wrecking in 1833," by T. Frederick Davis, *ibid.*
- "The Antillean Problem in Florida Archeology," by John W. Griffin, *ibid.*
- "The First Campaign of Publicity for Florida," by Charles L. Mowat, in the *Mississippi Valley Historical Review* (December).
- "Florida Slaves and Free Negroes in the Seminole War, 1835-1842," by Kenneth W. Porter, in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "Hotels, Inns, and Taverns in Mississippi, 1830-1860," by Samuel B. Olden, Jr., in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (October).
- "L. Q. C. Lamar's Taylor Farm: An Experiment in Diversified Farming," by Willie D. Halsell, *ibid.*
- "The Political Career of Thomas Overton Moore, Secession Governor of Louisiana," by Van D. Odom, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "The Louisiana People's Party," by Lucia Elizabeth Daniel, *ibid.*
- "Early Economic Life in Louisiana, 1804-1824 (An Historical Dialogue)," by Pierre de la Vergne, *ibid.*
- "Joseph Jefferson in New Orleans," by John Smith Kendall, *ibid.*
- "The Transition from Slave to Free Economy on the Willam J. Minor Plantations," by J. Carlyle Sitterson, in *Agricultural History* (October).

- "A Reconstruction Episode; Bishop Lay and Episcopal Church Reunion, 1865," by W. Henry Rector, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "The Arkansas River Floods of 1943," by Hugh Park, *ibid.*
- "Early Days in Columbia County [Arkansas]," by Glenn D. Martel, *ibid.*
- "Opie Read, Arkansas Journalist," by Robert L. Morris, *ibid.*
- "The Destiny of Buffalo Bayou," by Andrew Forest Muir, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "John A. Williams, Champion of Mexico in the Early Days of the Texas Revolution," by C. Allen True, *ibid.*
- "Life of General Don Manuel de Mier y Teran," continued, by Ohland Morton, *ibid.*

DOCUMENTS AND COMPILATIONS ON THE STATES OF THE LOWER SOUTH

- "Memoirs of Frederick Augustus Porcher," continued, edited by Samuel Gaillard Stoney, in the *South Carolina Historical and Genealogical Magazine* (October).
- "Marriage and Death Notices from the City Gazette of Charleston, S. C.," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Some Nineteenth Century South Carolina Imprints, 1801-1820," continued, by Douglas C. McMurtrie, *ibid.*
- "Abstracts from Records of the Court of Ordinary, 1764-1771," continued, contributed by Elizabeth H. Jervey, *ibid.*
- "Journal of General Peter Horry," continued, *ibid.*
- "The Confederate Letters of Warren G. Magee," edited by Bell I. Wiley, in the *Journal of Mississippi History* (October).
- "The Life of Jefferson Davis' by M'Arone," edited by T. Harry Williams and James S. Ferguson, *ibid.*
- "A Collection of Louisiana Confederate Letters," edited by Frank E. Vandiver, in the *Louisiana Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Index to the Spanish Judicial Records of Louisiana, LXXVIII, February-March, 1785," continued, by Laura L. Porteous, with marginal notes by Walter Prichard, *ibid.*
- "An Attack upon the Arkansas Post, 1783," edited by Anna Lewis, in the *Arkansas Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Letters of an Arkansas Confederate Soldier," continued, edited by D. D. O'Brien, *ibid.*
- "Check List of Texas Imprints, 1846-1876," continued, edited by E. W. Winkler, in the *Southwestern Historical Quarterly* (October).
- "Dr. John Sibley and the Louisiana-Texas Frontier, 1803-1814," continued, edited by Julia Kathryn Garrett, *ibid.*

GENERAL AND REGIONAL ARTICLES, DOCUMENTS, AND COMPILATIONS

- "Boating as a Sport in the Old South," by E. Merton Coulter, in the *Georgia Historical Quarterly* (September).
- "Camp Newspapers of the Confederacy," by Bell Irvin Wiley, in the *North Carolina Historical Review* (October).
- "Minnesota's Attitude toward the Southern Case for Secession," by F. Paul Prucha, in *Minnesota History* (December).
- "The Fugitive Slave Acts in Ohio," by Emmett D. Preston, in the *Journal of Negro History* (October).
- "New Mexico and the Sectional Controversy, 1846-1861," continued, by Loomis M. Ganaway, in the *New Mexico Historical Review* (October).
- "Schuyler Colfax and Reconstruction Policy," by Willard H. Smith, in the *Indiana Magazine of History* (December).
- "The Immediate Purpose of the Fourteenth Amendment," by Joseph B. James, *ibid.*
- "El Rio del Espiritu Santo," continued, by Jean Delanglez, in *Mid-America* (October).
- "Unpublished Mazzei Correspondence during His American Mission to Europe, 1780-1783," continued, edited by Howard R. Marraro, in the *William and Mary College Quarterly Historical Magazine* (October).

CONTRIBUTORS

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, president of the Southern Historical Association in 1943, is Kenan professor of history and government and director of the Southern Historical Collection at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill.

MISS WILLIE D. HALSELL, formerly a graduate student in history at Johns Hopkins University, lives at Itta Bena, Mississippi.

CHARLES L. MOWAT is assistant professor of history at the University of California, Los Angeles.

JAMES W. PATTON is professor and head of the department of history at North Carolina State College, Raleigh.

JAMES W. SILVER is associate professor and acting head of the department of history at the University of Mississippi.

H. PRENTICE MILLER is associate professor of English and associate dean of the College of Arts and Science at Emory University.

THE HISPANIC AMERICAN HISTORICAL REVIEW

*A quarterly circulated widely in Latin America and the
United States containing articles, inedited documents,
book reviews, minor notices, and professional news.*

MANAGING EDITOR: JOHN TATE LANNING
ASSOCIATE MANAGING EDITOR: ALAN K. MANCHESTER

BOARD OF EDITORS

ARTHUR S. AITON	IRVING A. LEONARD
CARLOS E. CASTANEDA	ALAN K. MANCHESTER
ROSCOE R. HILL	DANA G. MUNRO
ROLAND DENNIS HUSSEY	CHARLES E. NOWELL
JOHN TATE LANNING	ARTHUR P. WHITAKER

ADVISORY EDITORS

HERBERT E. BOLTON	CLARENCE H. HARING
ISAAC JOSLIN COX	J. FRED RIPPY
WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON	

SUBSCRIPTION RATES: \$4.00 A YEAR
SPECIAL RATES TO GRADUATE STUDENTS

DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS
Durham, North Carolina

VIRGINIA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Organized 1831—Chartered 1834

JOSEPH D. EGGLESTON, PRESIDENT

Publishers of the

VIRGINIA MAGAZINE OF HISTORY AND BIOGRAPHY

The October, 1943, issue contains the following:

In Search of Jefferson's Birthplace. by Fiske Kimball.

Harrisons in Virginia during the Reign of James I, by Francis
Burton Harrison.

*The Society of Colonial Wars in the State of Virginia; an Ad-
dress,* by J. C. Lockhart.

English Education of Thomas Nelson, Jr., of Yorktown, by
G. MacLaren Brydon.

Auditor Stegge's Accounts. Edited by Maude H. Woodfin.

Archibald Woods of Albemarle County, by Katie-Prince Ward.

Notes and Queries *Genealogies* *Book Reviews*

MEMBERSHIP DUES \$5.00 ANNUALLY

Magazine sent without additional charge to members.

Lee House, 707 East Franklin St.
RICHMOND, VA.

Editor and Corresponding Sec'y
CLAYTON TORRENCE



THE TEXAS STATE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

1897—*The Oldest Learned Society in Texas*—1897

Offers in

THE SOUTHWESTERN HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Articles, documents, comments, news notes, and book reviews
dealing with Texas and the Southwest

Managing Editor

WALTER PRESCOTT WEBB

Associate Editors

CHARLES W. HACKETT

RUDOLPH L. BIESELE

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$3.00 per year

Correspondence relating to contributions and subscriptions should be
addressed to the Managing Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

The Association also publishes

THE JUNIOR HISTORIAN

A literary and historical magazine by and for young people of
Junior High, Senior High, and Lower College levels. The first
magazine in America for young people also written almost
exclusively by them.

Editor

H. BAILEY CARROLL

Subscription rate: \$1.00 per school year.

Correspondence relating to *The Junior Historian* should be
addressed to the Editor, University Station, Austin, Texas.

THE SOUTHERN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

●

PRESIDENT

WENDELL H. STEPHENSON, Louisiana State University

VICE-PRESIDENT

FLETCHER M. GREEN, University of North Carolina

SECRETARY-TREASURER

JAMES W. PATTON, North Carolina State College

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

(In addition to the officers named above)

EX-PRESIDENTS

(For three years following expiration of their terms)

BENJAMIN B. KENDRICK, Woman's College of the University of
North Carolina (1944)

ALBERT B. MOORE, University of Alabama (1945)

J. G. DE ROULHAC HAMILTON, University of North Carolina (1946)

MANAGING EDITOR

WILLIAM C. BINKLEY, Vanderbilt University

ELECTED MEMBERS

ALFRED J. HANNA, Rollins College (1944)

BERNARD MAYO, University of Virginia (1944)

WILLIAM G. BEAN, Washington and Lee University (1945)

JENNINGS B. SANDERS, Memphis State College (1945)

LYNN M. CASE, Louisiana State University (1946)

RALPH B. FLANDERS, New York University (1946)